UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO QUARTERLY

Duke University Library
FEB 17 1941
Durham, N. C.

JANUARY, 1941

Henry James: The War Chapter, 1914-1916 ..... Leon Edel
Political Parties and Nationalism in South Africa ..... A. Brady
Thomas Wolfe: Realist and Symbolist ..... E. K. Brown
The Pattern of Milton's *Nativity Ode* ..... Arthur Barker
On a Certain Revival of Enthusiasm ..... F. H. Anderson
Commercialism and the Jews ..... Bernard Lande Cohen
The War and Opinion:
I. The Next British Empire ..... Donald Cowie
II. India and the War ..... G. S. Brett
III. Canadian Labour and the War ..... Philip Child
IV. Christian Civilization ..... Lord Eustace Percy

Reviews
Ideals of Religion ..... Sir Robert Falconer
Foreign News and the Press ..... B. K. Sandwell
The Defence of Canada ..... A. R. M. Lower
The Master and His Fellows ..... Douglas Bush
For Student and General Reader ..... Arthur E. Case

PUBLISHED BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY OF CANADA, LIMITED
Distributors

THE PARASITES OF MAN

By

THOMAS W. M. CAMERON

Parasitology is so old that no one knows its origin. In the last ten years it has rapidly developed as a science. It has shown how to conquer some of the most virulent and important diseases of man.

This book is intended for the medical man. It includes only what the practitioner requires.

The author is a member of the staff of McGill University and was formerly of Edinburgh University.

We should like to send you a copy on approval.

$3.00

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS
TORONTO, CANADA

RELIANCE ENGRAVERS LIMITED

104 BOND ST. TORONTO

ARTISTS · ENGRAVERS · ELECTROTYPERS

PHONE ELGIN 0411

OUR EXPERIENCE WILL SAVE YOU MONEY

CONTENTS

VOL. X JANUARY, 1941 No. 2

Henry James: The War Chapter, 1914-1916.....LEON EDEL 125
Political Parties and Nationalism in South Africa..A. BRADY 139
Thomas Wolfe: Realist and Symbolist.....E. K. BROWN 153
The Pattern of Milton's *Nativity Ode*.....ARTHUR BARKER 167
On a Certain Revival of Enthusiasm.....F. H. ANDERSON 182
Commercialism and the Jews.....BERNARD LANDE COHEN 197
The War and Opinion:
I. The Next British Empire.....DONALD COWIE 204
II. India and the War.....G. S. BRETT 210
III. Canadian Labour and the War.....PHILIP CHILD 216
IV. Christian Civilization.....LORD EUSTACE PERCY 225

Reviews
Ideals of Religion.....SIR ROBERT FALCONER 228
Foreign News and the Press.....B. K. SANDWELL 235
The Defence of Canada.....A. R. M. LOWER 239
The Master and His Fellows.....DOUGLAS BUSH 241
For Student and General Reader.....ARTHUR E. CASE 245

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

F. H. Anderson, Professor of Philosophy in the University, has written works on Plato and Locke.

Arthur Barker, a member of the English staff in Trinity College, has published a number of articles on Milton, and has in preparation a book on Milton's prose writings.

G. S. Brett, Dean of the School of Graduate Studies in the University, was for some years a professor at Lahore in the Punjab.

Douglas Bush, a graduate of the University, and Professor of English at Harvard, is the author of a number of distinguished studies in the literature of the Renaissance.

A. E. Case, Professor of English in Northwestern University, is the author of many publications on the literature of eighteenth-century England.

Philip Child, the well-known novelist, is now engaged, for the Institute of International Affairs, on a survey of Canadian opinion and the war.

Bernard Lande Cohen, a barrister in Montreal, has previously contributed to the Quarterly articles on current affairs.

Donald Cowie, a New Zealander now living in England, is the author of *Empire Prepared* (1939).

Leon Edel is the author of *Henry James, les années dramatiques* and *The Prefaces of Henry James*. He has in preparation an edition of James's plays.

Sir Robert Falconer is the former President of the University.

A. R. M. Lower, Professor of History in United College, University of Manitoba, held a commission in the navy in the last war and has written a number of works on Canadian affairs.

Lord Eustace Percy, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Durham, has kindly sent to us for "The War and Opinion" a portion of an address delivered in his University.

B. K. Sandwell, a graduate of the University, is the editor of *Saturday Night*.

HENRY JAMES: THE WAR CHAPTER
1914-1916

LEON EDEL

AT right angles to Lamb House stood the garden-room where Henry James dictated most of his later novels and essays. It was a house apart, in substantial tawny-coloured brick, but consisting only of one long room. The novelist, as he paced the floor and measured out his sonorous sentences to the accompanying tick of Theodora Bosanquet's typewriter, could see from large windows at one end the irregular old street; from the other he looked out at the carefully-kept garden. Lamb House proper was his home; here he received his friends and wrote his letters and read and played with his favourite dachshund. The garden-room was the inner sanctum: his visitors, sitting in the garden, could hear in the morning the old voice rising, falling, and pausing in the fashioning of his complicated sentences. It was the novelist's laboratory, where at fixed hours of the day, uninterrupted, and adhering rigidly to his routine, he could perform his alchemy of words.

This sanctuary and ivory tower of the Master was in the old Sussex town of Rye, which for centuries had known only quiet and peace. In 1937 when I visited it, it seemed cut off from the world. The town salts spreading toward Folkstone isolated the highly-perched houses. Grass grew between the cobbles in the side streets; the only traffic that circulated in them was the occasional bicycle bumping over the stones. It was a blessed, remote, friendly little nook of the Western World.

In its sky, in the last days of August, 1940, there appeared the raiders. They swept high over the red roof-tops, flying in a straight line, and dropped their sticks of bombs through the clear air of the old town. One bomb scored a direct hit on Henry James's garden-room, shattering it just as surely as the First Great War had shattered the life of the novelist.

I

Henry James spent the summer of 1914 at Lamb House. It was a beautiful summer. He spoke of its beauty in all his letters.

The days were long, calm, clear; the channel a fine horizon-line of blue. ("Never were desperate doings so blandly lighted up," he wrote later.) He had completed recently two volumes of reminiscences and lived still too far in the past to be more than casually aware of disturbing elements in the present. The present seemed comfortable and calm, and he was determined to permit nothing to disturb it.

On July 28, the day the Central Powers declared war on Serbia, James wrote to Mrs Alfred Sutro that he was hugging his provincial privacy—"I cravenly avert my eyes and stop my ears." But he could not shut out the thunder. Three days later he was recording his first reactions to the now imminent disaster. At one blow his world had been destroyed. He found himself saying that the tranquil, ordered, civilized, cultivated world in which he had lived for almost three-quarters of a century had been a fool's paradise, carrying "this abomination in its blood." He cursed the "treacherous years" and the conditions of his life that had permitted him to live on unaware of approaching catastrophe.

He felt himself suddenly betrayed. It was as if, he said, he had discovered in his family circle, or among his best friends, "a band of murderers, swindlers and villains . . . : it makes us wonder whom in the world we are now to live with." For the moment he did not blame his own lack of perception. He blamed rather the deception civilization had practised on him. It has been easy for a later generation, after the fact, to accuse those who preceded them, and James among others, of blindness. Henry James, all-perceptive where human feelings and motives were concerned, did not see the larger writing on the wall, along with many of the most thoughtful men of his time. Society in general was taken by surprise. War found it unfortified. Unlike the Second Great War, whose coming was prepared for by a long, tragic series of events, the First Great War came to a large section of the world with all the violence and unexpectedness of a sudden storm. "Everything blackened over and for the time blighted by the hideous public situation," James scrawled on August 3. Britain went to war on August 4.

II

The first days of the war were for Henry James "a nightmare from which there is no waking save by sleep." He described himself as living under the "funeral pall of our murdered civilization."

He told his nephew, William, that "every interest and every connection that seemed still to exist up to exactly a month ago has been as annihilated as if it had never lifted a head in the world at all." To Mrs Sutro he wrote: "I dip my nose, or try to, into the inkpot as often as I can; but it's as if there were no ink there, and I take it out smelling gunpowder, smelling blood, as hard as it did before."

Standing among the ruins of his world, the first question for him was, as for all artists, how can my art have any importance when life is held so cheap? What importance can I, or anyone, attach to a code of living, to civilization, to compassion, justice, truth, when all thought, all society, is bending its efforts towards treachery, deceit, and destruction? "You and I, the ornaments of our generation, should have been spared this wreck of our belief," he wrote to Rhoda Broughton.

It did not occur to him now that the artist should be *audessus de la mêlée*, as he had once argued eloquently in discussing Mrs Browning's similar predicament in mid-nineteenth-century Italy. An artist, he had written, possessing the "high range of genius" should give the impression of having a "sacred sense of proportion" even under the stress of "emotion and passion." For a time in 1914 Henry James lost that sense of proportion. It was natural and inevitable. He was too old, too tired, too humanly conscious of the disaster to find any avenue of escape from it. The so-called ivory-tower novelist had no ivory tower in which to find sanctuary. Had there ever been, really, an ivory tower? George Moore, whom critics regarded as much more of a realist than James, calmly continued to polish his prose amid the thunder of war, shut tightly within the ramparts of his ego. Henry James's friend, John Singer Sargent, painting in the Austrian Tyrol, refused to believe Britain was at war, and argued, if she was why should he stop painting, until friends dragged him from his lofty perch to escape internment. H. G. Wells and Bernard Shaw, always vigorous pamphleteers, found in the war new subjects for polemic. Henry James could find no escape in work.

Could it be, he asked himself, that he had been writing about the wrong things, the unimportant things? The picture of "little private adventures" which formed the substance of his novels and tales "simply fades away before the great public adventure," he wrote, and he echoed it in another form: "the private adventure so

utterly blighted by the public." Reality had become a world capable of producing a war such as this one, "and how represent that horrific capability, *historically* latent, historically ahead of it?" he asked.

Then gradually he began to feel that the war was as much a part of his experience as all that had gone before. The great sheet of his sensitivity began to receive a new record; his inquisitive mind reached out once again; he sniffed at the "air-blown particles" of life even if they smelled of gunpowder; he sought out the new experience with the old intensity even though there was agony in it. He was too human to be capable of closing his eyes to suffering, and too generous to keep to himself when so much privation was manifest around him; not only material privation, which he had always looked upon with bitterness, but the loss of such common things as light and laughter and kindness. He watched bright young men he had admired go off to be killed. He saw the darkness of conflict settle over England. And he groped about seeking a foothold in the dark. Had James foreseen the war, and understood better the decay he saw too clearly in his society, his surprise might have been less, but his suffering would have been just as great.

III

Inevitably, Henry James's mind went back to another war. Across a crowded half century he seemed to hear again Mr Lincoln's call to arms. Looking about him at the tension and alarm, feeling the quickened public pulse, he could say to himself: "I have seen all this before. I am initiated." There was "the sudden new tang in the atmosphere, the flagrant difference . . . in the look of everything, especially in that of people's faces, the expressions, the hushes, the clustered groups, the detached wanderers . . . so many impressions long before received and in which the stretch of more than half a century had still left a sharpness." He remembered that the American Civil War had been a long war; "if the present complication should but begin to be as long as it was broad no term of comparison borrowed from the past would so much as begin to fit it." Soon he discovered important differences: "the rate, and the scale, and the speed and the unprecedented engines, the vast incalculable connections." He had been a spectator of the Civil War at the dawn of his creative life; now in its twilight

he was to be a spectator of the new conflict, more horrible than any before.

He brooded on it during those early weeks in Rye, as the waves of desolation swept over the world. He awoke each day to find "the most benign conditions of light and air, of sky and sea, the most beautiful English summer conceivable," but these were mixed with "all the violence of action and passion." The loneliness that seized him was for the time mitigated by the presence of his niece, Peggy; then she left and he felt isolated in his tiny corner while stirring events, on a giant scale, were taking place beyond. "This," he told himself, "as you can see better than ever before, is the rare, the sole, the exquisite England, whose weight now hangs in the balance, and your appreciation of whose value, much as in the easy years you may have taken it for granted, seems exposed to some fresh and strange and strong determinant, something that breaks in like a character of high color in a play." He walked the streets of Rye, going to and fro along the old town rampart, where the lookout had once been maintained against the coming of Napoleon's ships. Here he spent his "aching wonder again and again on the bright skyline. . . . Just over that line were unutterable things, massacre and ravage and anguish," yet he had but to turn his head to take in the familiar lovable scene.

One evening the town's usual calm was broken by the sound of voices; a vague disturbance that caused James to come to the door-step of Lamb House. Up the curving steep street leading from the railway station, over the old stones, there trudged the first refugees from Belgium to reach Rye. The novelist watched them pass in the autumn twilight, their drawn, sad faces lit by the flare of a single street lamp. There was mainly the sound of heavy, shuffling feet. No voices were raised; but the quick ear of the old man, standing there, caught the sobbing of a young mother carrying her small child. For James that sound, in the old street, was "the voice itself of history." It rang in his ears for weeks. The war had come to the door-step of Lamb House.

IV

Henry James went to London. He wanted to escape from his loneliness, and to feel himself "nearer to information and to supporting and suggestive contact." He found himself in a feverish war capital. Brought face to face with the refugees in Chelsea, watch-

ing his valet, Burgess (the "indispensable" Burgess, who had served him for years and travelled with him through the United States) go off to war, reading the day-to-day *communiqués*, hearing reports from Edith Wharton of her work in France, identifying himself with the work of the American Volunteer Motor-Ambulance Corps in France, Henry James gradually became a participant in the incidents and echoes of the war along the civilian front. People who met him as he wandered down Cheyne Walk said he looked like a forlorn, lost soul; yet he was far from lost, for he told himself that despite the "wholesale annihilation, it *is* somehow, *life*."

He did not probe too deeply into the war's causes. It was a war to end wars, to make the world safe for democracy, to establish a permanent peace, and he believed peace was worth fighting for. Yet his mind, seeking the basic ill, the rottenness at the core, found it with ease, and his expression of it flowed from the tip of his pen one February day in 1915 as he was writing to Mrs William James. He had been speaking of the magnificent response of Britain's "upper classes" and had expressed the belief that the war was giving "society" a "new lease of life." But why shouldn't it? he suddenly pulled himself up and asked. "Society in wars always does play up—and it is by them and for them, that the same are mostly made." There it was, the hard shell of a stubborn truth; the social structure had as yet evolved no other way of obtaining a "new lease of life" than by the extermination of life.

There was no question where James's sympathies lay when it came to the conflicting nations. The American novelist at once identified himself with Britain. He spoke of "our" navy, government, arms, and he criticized President Wilson's neutrality. Arnold Bennett noted in his journal as early in the war as November 4, 1914: "Hy. James is strongly pro-English and comes to weeping-point sometimes." The novelist had never loved Germany, had actively disliked much of its culture, and had returned from his few visits to German cities and watering places only to delight in the softness and warmth of France and Italy, in the Latin temper, charm, and wit. Unlike his brother William, he had never mastered the German tongue. The record of his readings in German literature is meagre. German meals and the hours of their meals, their bed-clothes, their stoves, their sausages, their faces, and their beer, he once told Dame Ethel Smyth on meeting her in the Dresden gallery, went against the grain. Dislike of these national character-

istics was as nothing beside the feeling of horror inspired in him by the invasion of Belgium and France. The destruction of Louvain and later of Rheims, the waste of treasures of the ages James had cherished, added to that of human life, served only to convince him further of the rightness of Britain's fight.

As the young novelists and poets he knew—Rupert Brooke, Hugh Walpole, Compton Mackenzie—took up war posts, he expressed envy for the "young doers of things and engagers in action." He warmly supported—and aided by writing an appeal—the work of young Richard Norton with the American Volunteer Ambulance Corps. He began to visit the wounded in the hospitals, and the refugees in their shelters. "I should feel I had lost something that ministers to life and knowledge if our collective experience, for all its big black streaks, hadn't been imposed on us," he reasoned in a letter to T. S. Perry in the autumn of 1914. Consoling himself in this fashion, he began to find the general communal effort—something quite new to him—"sustaining and inspiring."

In the street he stopped soldiers to talk with them. He made up parcels for men he knew at the front. When the ex-postman of Rye came to London to join the naval brigade, Henry James put him up in his apartment. He took soldiers to lunch. He met a hobbling khaki convalescent and poured out the contents of his pockets for him. "I must have committed myself to the support of him for the remainder of his days," he told Mrs Wharton. Thus his sympathies overflowed, and his kindliness and generosity found greater outlets than they had ever found before.

V

He was "cultivating small arts of escape" he admitted in March of 1915, "small plunges into oblivion and dissimulation." He was able to read again, but he complained of the "paralysis of my own power to do anything but increasingly and inordinately *feel*, feel in a way to make communication with almost all others impossible. . . ." This awareness of the suffering around him made escape difficult. And he was haunted by new ghosts. Rupert Brooke died, and he poured out his sorrow at the extinction of the young poet he had known briefly at Cambridge, and of other young men, less known, sons of friends, in whose grief Henry James, with his great capacity for participation, shared. His last piece of work was his introduction to Brooke's *Letters from America*, a tender

memorial to one whom James described as "a creature on whom the gods had smiled their brightest." At the same time Henry James's grief did not close his critical eyes; with delicacy he complained of Rupert Brooke's "too innocently enormous . . . cynicism" and with gentleness wished he had been able to take the young man by the hand during his visit to New York "and show him finer lights."

Arthur Christopher Benson, who lunched with Henry James in April of 1915, found him "very tremendous; he looks ill, he changes color, he is darker under the eyes. . . . He ate a plentiful meal of veal and pudding, but he spoke to me very gravely of his physical condition and his chronic angina. . . . He is slower and more *soigneux* in utterance than ever, but leaves a deep impression of majesty, beauty and greatness. He said that his life was now one flurried escape from sociability. . . ."

He may have felt that he wanted to escape sociability; actually he sought it. He began dining out in high circles, seeking every grain of news and gossip he could find, talking confidentially to Britain's statesmen and America's envoys, trying to be as close to the "inside" as possible. If he abhorred the consequences of war, he was insatiably curious about its conduct. He went to luncheon with the Prime Minister, the Right Hon. H. H. Asquith, and with Winston Churchill, then First Lord of the Admiralty, "people I don't, in my sequestered way, often see," he wrote to Walter Berry, the international jurist, who had himself brought Henry James news of conditions in German territory.

Finding himself at least in luncheon-proximity with the leaders of the war effort and its official observers restored the author's somewhat diminished sense of self-importance and helped mitigate the feeling of uselessness the artist experiences when he is cast aside in favour of the soldier. Henry James frankly enjoyed picking up war gossip and passing it on. In Arnold Bennett's journal we find this note under the date of May 8, 1915: "Pinker told me some good new small things about the conduct of the war. He gets most of his information through Henry James." J. B. Pinker was Bennett's as well as James's literary agent. He it was who told Bennett of the novelist's conversations with Colonel E. M. House and another American observer, who agreed that the German government had no hope whatever of victory; that the German government was in a "state of terror" as to the British

navy, "feeling themselves like men in a room from which the air was being slowly withdrawn"; that the food question was likely to be troublesome before harvest and that there was no first-class leader in Germany.

Such wishful thinking must have helped to sustain James. He found solace, too, at the American embassy, in conversations with Ambassador Walter Hines Page. Again Arnold Bennett records what Pinker told him: "They have long talks together. First time H. J. opened his heart to Page, he stopped and said, 'But I oughtn't to talk like this to you, a neutral.' Said Page, 'My dear man, if you knew how it does one good to hear it'!"

VI

Henry James considered himself a belligerent and favoured United States intervention. He pleaded in his letters to his American friends for an understanding of Britain's fight and for moral support. In our time he would have argued certainly for all possible aid, short of war, and perhaps for war itself. "How can one help seeing that such aggression," he told a correspondent of the *New York Times* who came to interview him, "if hideously successful in Europe, would, with as little loss of time as possible, proceed to apply itself to the American side of the world; and how can one, therefore, not feel that the Allies are fighting to the death for the soul and the purpose that are in *us*, for the defence of every ideal that has most guided our growth and that most assures our unity?" These might very well be the words of President Roosevelt in 1940; they were spoken by Henry James in 1915.

For the moment James was uncomfortably astride two horses, one the mount of Technical Neutrality, the other that of Spiritual Belligerency. However he might think himself British, he was officially a "foreigner" in a land he felt in no way foreign to him. When he wanted to return to Lamb House he discovered that it was situated in a "restricted area" and that even a "friendly Alien" like himself had to report to the police regularly. Nothing could have been more distasteful to the novelist. To have his freedom of movement hindered in a land in which he had lived for forty years was a rude shock to Henry James.

There was an alternative. He could become in fact a citizen of the Empire of which he was already a citizen in spirit. The step was difficult for one who had, in the back of his mind, clung to his

Americanism. He must have weighed the alternatives for a long time. It is extremely doubtful whether at the outset he envisaged his decision as an international gesture. "Hadn't it been for the War," he wrote to his nephew Henry, "I should certainly have gone on as I was. . . ." It is quite possible that his English friends, men like Sir Edmund Gosse and G. W. Prothero, editor of the *Quarterly Review*, may have made more of his decision publicly than he intended. Whatever may have gone on in that elaborate mind, we know that by June 24, 1915, it was made up, for on that day he wrote to his nephew: "I feel that if I take this step I shall simply rectify a position that has become inconveniently and uncomfortably false, making my civil status merely agree not only with my moral, but with my material as well, in every kind of way. . . . I have spent here all the best years of my life—they practically have *been* my life; . . . the reis not the least possibility, at my age, and in my state of health, of my ever returning to the United States or taking up any relation with it as a country."

On June 28, he wrote to Mr Asquith of the wish "to testify at this crisis to the force of my attachment and devotion to England and to the cause for which she is fighting." He added: "I can only testify by laying at her feet my explicit, my material and spiritual allegiance, and throwing into the scale of her fortune my all but imponderable moral weight—'a poor thing but mine own.'" He thereupon asked the Prime Minister to be one of his sponsors so that his application would be "proportionately expedited." Other sponsors were Gosse, Prothero, and Pinker. In mid-July the Home Secretary, Sir John Simon, informed him that he had ordered the issue of his certificate of naturalization, and at 4.30 P.M. on July 26, James took his oath of allegiance to King George V.

Many persons at the time and later interpreted Henry James's act as a gesture of anger with the United States for not entering the war, taking perhaps too literally his none-too-serious remark that Mr Wilson could have straightened the matter out for him with "one waggle of his little finger." It is obvious that his naturalization would have been unnecessary if the United States had been Britain's ally. The uproar that ensued in the United States probably startled James, although he urbanely remarked that America had a "great doctrine that to invite scores and scores of millions of aliens to naturalize themselves with *her* is in the highest degree exemplary and edifying" and yet "any such proceed-

ings on the part of her own children elsewhere deserves but signal reprobation." His motives were clear enough; a matter of expediency became a gesture of solidarity, and it was inevitable that it should be publicized. A friend of James's, Mr Logan Pearsall Smith, once told me that he met him shortly after the event and found him full of misgivings; he wondered whether, after all, he should have taken a step which seemed to him direct enough but which was magnified disproportionately both in England and America. Praise and abuse poured in throughout that summer; but it is doubtful whether ultimately Henry James regretted his move. Of his sincerity of conviction and honesty of motive there can be no question. We have only to read his war essays to understand the intensity of his feelings.

VII

In half a dozen essays Henry James gave expression to his unhappiness, grief and horror, and his conviction that injured civilization would triumph. He did not wring his hands, or beat the patriotic drum. These essays touched the consequences, not the causes of war; the refugees and exiles, the invasion of France and Belgium, the soldiers in the hospitals, the work of the American volunteers. For all the helpless victims the deep well of Henry James's compassion overflowed. He was the kindest of men. He might be intolerant of stupidity; he might turn his irony and satire against the "headlong fools" of this world, but for mankind in general he had only an overflowing warmth. His essays on the wounded and the refugees are filled with tenderness; the emotional stress, as he visited them, talking to them in involved sentences they probably never completely understood, must have been great, and it emerges on every page. Walking down the long wards he was reminded of the citizen-soldiers of the Civil War; and he mused on this sad spectacle of the man of action, trained to advance, fight, destroy, suddenly reduced to the helplessness of a hospital cot. "How can creatures so amiable . . . have welcomed even for five minutes the stress of carnage?" he asked. "How can the stress of carnage, the murderous impulse at the highest pitch, have left so little distortion of the moral nature?" For the first time in years Henry James, the *habitué* of drawing-rooms and country houses, was coming into direct touch with a wider variety of his fellow-men, under conditions of suffering and misery he had not seen since the

Civil War, unless during his visit to Ireland in 1895 when he was shocked to find the splendours of a vice-regal court in the midst of so much poverty and squalor. As he met and talked with the soldiers and the refugees, many of them products of the slums of London and the continent, and saw them thriving under the care administered in the hospitals and shelters, he found that a

> vivid moral . . . asks to be drawn. The deepest impression from the sore human stuff with which such observation deals is that of its being strong and sound in an extraordinary degree for the conditions producing it. These conditions represent, one feels at the best, the crude and the waste, the ignored and neglected state; and under the sense of the small care and scant provision that have attended such hearty and happy growths, struggling into life and air with no furtherance to speak of, the question comes pressingly home of what a better economy might, or verily mightn't result in. If this abundance all slighted and unencouraged can still comfort us, what wouldn't it do for us tended and fostered and cultivated?

When he writes about France, he is dealing with the land whose "name means more than anything in the world to us but just our own," and here in eleven pages he sums up a whole lifetime of devotion and love for the Gallic genius; a country whose name, for Henry James, is synonymous with civilization. It is difficult to read this luminous essay, reflecting James's acute appreciation of the French quality of mind and not think of the France of the Second Great War: "bleeding at every pore, while at no time in all her history so completely erect, . . . our incalculable, immortal France." France summed up for the novelist "the life of the mind and the life of the senses alike, together, in the most irrepressible freedom of either"; on her soil man could "fraternize with himself . . . taste all his faculties, and in consequence . . . find and . . . make the earth a friendlier, and easier, and especially a more various sojourn." England was blessed, James found, to have so close a neighbour whose national genius was so richly different from her own.

Henry James discussed Britain's genius and the qualities of the English mind in two essays, "Within the Rim" which gave its title to the posthumous volume of war essays, and "The Question of the Mind." Those are the most autobiographical of the war essays. In "Within the Rim," an urbane and beautiful essay, Henry James described his feelings at the outbreak of the war and spoke of Britain's "settled sea-confidence." The key to this confidence was England's snug insularity; unlike France and Belgium she had never yet in modern times known invasion. She disclosed a toughness that he admired; and as an American he found himself

partaking "of shared instincts and ideals, of a communion of race and tongue, temper and tradition . . . the melting together of the spiritual sources."

In the "Question of the Mind," writing in a subtler vein, James turned to the essential problem for him, of his appreciation of the English mind. The question for Henry James, after four decades of faith in the mind of Britain, was to determine whether he still believed in it, and whether, during these years, his faith had been warranted. "The decision in suspense," he wrote, "mattered to this fond observer himself, thrown back upon half his spiritual history, so much more than it could possibly matter to persons either not agitated at all or agitated to more demonstrable and more immediate purpose." If he could not arrive at a decision, he said, he would have "declined into misery." He "sought certitude" that all these years his judgment had been accurate. He had believed that the British mind and the British genius was capable of standing up against the great shock of war; that the absence of display on the part of an Englishman was in reality indicative of qualities unseen, but in which one could have complete trust. . . . "When a Frenchman or an Italian talked he really told you so much about his mind that there seemed little left to tell you about anything else." Not so the Englishman. He might talk, but you would find "a vast tract of the recorded history of your relation with him unaccounted for."

Essentially, British good nature was the fundamental attribute, the novelist decided. It was this good nature which would carry Britain through the war. It threw light on the British character and this character in turn threw light on the British mind. It led Henry James to the conclusion that "the mind was so drenched with the character, in opposition to the examples in which the character was drenched with the mind that all one could at the very best feel was that the value finally run to earth was a value which would do for everything."

VIII

The excitement over Henry James's naturalization subsided. The novelist settled down, dragging himself through the late summer and autumn of 1915, hoping to return to the writing of fiction. He dictated the beginning of his third volume of reminiscences, *The Middle Years*, and casting about for a fictional subject he picked up again a novel he had begun years earlier, *The Sense of the*

Past, dealing with the adventures of a young twentieth-century American who walks into eighteenth-century London. This seemed an admirable subject, sufficiently removed from the present, and he turned to it eagerly. Percy Lubbock tells us that James spent the eve of his last illness, December 1, 1915, turning the pages of his manuscript intending to go on with it the next morning.

That morning he had a stroke. " 'So it's come at last'—I said to myself—'the distinguished thing,' " he has been quoted as relating to his friends in the early stages of his illness. By December 10, he was reported to be progressing satisfactorily. Pneumonia set in, however, and his condition fluctuated through that month. There were days when he was delirious and he thought he was dictating to his amanuensis in his delirium. To calm him Miss Bosanquet brought in the typewriter, and its familiar tick seemed to have a soothing effect. He dictated half-formed sentences; at one moment part of a letter concerning changes to be made in the Tuileries Gardens—but no great "Napoleonic fragment" as some have claimed. By the end of December he had improved to such an extent that no further bulletins were issued by his physicians.

Mrs William James and her daughter Peggy had come over to be with him. His nephew, Henry, was at his side for a while, but was called back to America. With the New Year came the King's honours list and Britain reciprocated the novelist's expression of allegiance. Now that he was a British subject he was entitled to the highest honours Britain confers on her distinguished men. The insignia of the Order of Merit accordingly were brought to his bedside by Lord Bryce.

Henry James had expressed the hope that there would be no "partial recovery," and he had his wish. Through the first weeks of the new year he lay on an invalid's couch, looking off over the river, watching the clouds, the sunsets, the barges. There was no suffering; "even the consciousness of his helplessness and mental confusion has translated itself into happy wandering and pleasant foreign places and old friends," Mrs William James wrote to Barrett Wendell. "It is long since he has refused to have letters, messages or even names. And he has never once asked about the war."

He had shut out the war at last. "We sit with him, Peggy and I, but we do not talk. Everything seems trivial in the presence of this great serenity of spirit," Mrs James wrote on February 28, 1916. Henry James died on that day.

POLITICAL PARTIES AND NATIONALISM IN SOUTH AFRICA

A. Brady

LIKE Canada, South Africa is bi-national and bi-lingual. Its white population is comprised of two national strains: the Dutch (considerably mixed with German and French elements) represent close to 60 per cent, and the British something under 40 per cent. But the contrasts with Canada are in some respects pronounced; notably in the impact of bi-nationalism upon party politics. The parties more starkly divide along national, or in the current South African term, racial lines. The struggle of Boers and British in the nineteenth century still influences the political alignments of the twentieth, shaping the conviction of many Afrikanders that upon them rests the duty of fulfilling the ideals of the Voortrekkers. In such a community the springs of political argument and action are frequently historical memories and antipathies. On the platteland especially, the Afrikander responds to a political mythology fashioned in the struggle against the British for independence, or at least for the preservation of the group's culture. Hence cleavages of social class, or divisions on the basis of economic interest, have intruded less candidly into party politics than in any other Dominion; they have been obscured by the larger and more absorbing passions of nationalism. They have importance, but are subordinate to the issues of race and nationality, not being powerful enough to dominate formally in the struggle of the major parties.

This fact has clearly emerged in the history of party alignments since the grant of responsible government to the former republics in 1907. In the two northern and Boer colonies, parties then came to power that were mainly Dutch in nationality and coincidently rural in social structure, for the population in the country was principally Dutch while that in the towns of the Witwatersrand was principally British. In the Transvaal, Het Volk (the People) controlled half the membership of the legislature, and was led by the astute Boer General of the recent war, Louis Botha. In the Orange Free State a parallel party, the Orangie Unie, was actually if not formally presided over by the veteran statesman of republican days, M. T. Steyn, and was more powerful in the colony than Het Volk in the Transvaal, the British population being a smaller

minority. In the Cape the Dutch party, the Afrikander Bond, had been active since the early eighties, and naturally had closer personal and ideological links with the English-speaking community, especially with the liberals who constituted the leadership of the South African party. Prior to 1910 Natal was the only colony where the national cleavage in politics was unimportant, mainly because of the paucity of the Dutch population. Indeed parties of any kind in Natal were undeveloped; in the first elections after Union eleven of the seventeen representatives from the province were Independents.

The invitation of the Governor-General to Louis Botha to form the first ministry under the Union was intended as an auspicious gesture. John X. Merriman, the English-born Prime Minister of the Cape, might reasonably have been chosen: he was very able, the most experienced public man in South Africa, and received support among both Dutch and British. But Botha, a heroic figure of the late war, possessed vast prestige among his own people, and had, in abundant measure, the generous qualities essential to implement the attitude of racial *rapprochement* which had dominated the National Convention. He could best realize the vision of Jan Smuts, "a union not of top-dog and under-dog, but of brothers." To do so was his genuine ambition. He viewed the South Africa Act as ushering in a new era when Boer and Briton should cease their strife. His ministers, mainly Afrikander, were drawn from the previous colonial administrations, and the party which sat behind him in the new legislature, the South African National party, was a merger of Het Volk, the Unie and the Bond and South African groups in the Cape, with such Natalians as wished to promote national conciliation. In opposition there emerged the Unionist party, consisting of South Africans of British extraction who feared that the dominance of the conservative rural Dutch would impede economic development. The Unionists had in their ranks the enlightened, aggressive capitalists of the Rand, and were led for a short time by the former colleague of Cecil Rhodes, Dr Starr Jameson. In addition there was in the Assembly a small Labour group.

Events soon proved that Botha's South African party was without cohesion. The ideal of its leader—a nation growing out of the gradual fusion of the two European peoples—did not appeal with equal force to all its Afrikander members; many instinctively shrank

from absorption in Anglo-Saxon life and feared that racial conciliation must inevitably mean such absorption. Their fears did not disappear with time, and they found a leader in the aggressive figure whom Botha had invited to his cabinet from the Free State, General J. B. M. Hertzog. A succession of events led, in 1912, to the break between Botha and Hertzog, and the subsequent formation of a Nationalist party under the leadership of the latter. Personal temperament and sectional feelings had a part in bringing about the secession, but the basic circumstance was that Hertzog championed the cause of those who believed that a policy of national reconciliation would inevitably sacrifice the Afrikander, render him less conscious of and interested in his own culture, and push him into the vortex of imperialism, with all the sinister meaning of imperialism to the Boer. To the isolated and conservative farmer of the platteland this cause made a powerful appeal. For two generations he had been taught by his leaders (not least by the *predikants* of the Dutch Reformed Church) to distrust and fear British influence, whether peaceful or otherwise; for it was a force which threatened to change the deeply entrenched customs of his life and to undermine that rugged independence, developed from the day when his forefathers had begun to trek and to fight northward across the coastal mountain ranges. "Nothing," wrote Olive Schreiner more than forty years ago, "so indicates the dogged, and almost fierce strength of the South African Boer as this unique conservatism"; and she added, "In him the 17th century and even remnants of the 16th century are found surviving as among few peoples in Europe."[1] Her remarks applied with equal force in 1912. The farmer of the platteland still had his conservatism, the product of isolation on the veld.[2] To hold fast to his culture, to cling to the traditions of the group, seemed to him a fundamental law of life, and led him to recoil from a fusion of nationalities, towards which the policy of Botha was ultimately directed.

In challenging Botha, Hertzog formulated what he called the "two-stream" policy, concerned not with one but with two peoples, ensuring the preservation of the Afrikanders as a distinct cultural group. After withdrawal from the South African party, he and his associates emphasized most the relations of the Union with the

[1]Olive Schreiner, *Thoughts on South Africa*, p. 256.

[2]Eric Walker's *The Frontier Tradition in South Africa* (1930) is an essay of interest.

Empire. Consistently they were hostile towards measures of imperial co-operation, viewing the Empire either with cold indifference or positive hate. "Imperialism," said Hertzog, "is only important to me when it is useful to South Africa";—a concessive remark, since the more ardent of his followers denied that the Empire could under any circumstances be useful to South Africa. They favoured independence. In the naval rivalry between Great Britain and Germany prior to 1914, the Nationalists were unfriendly to Botha's plan of contributions to the Royal Navy. In the past the navy had shattered the hopes of their people, and they were not ready to squander money or sympathy on its fate. Imperialism and the capitalism on the Rand they viewed as one and the same thing, and were convinced that the movement in the Union for a stronger British navy issued from the foreign financiers in Johannesburg. They looked with suspicion upon the presence of ministers at Imperial Conferences, and news that Botha, while attending the Conference of 1911, had been the guest of His Majesty in full court dress, including silk stockings, continued for many a month to irritate his nationalist compatriots. Botha's silk stockings "gradually assumed the shape of a symbol of national treason."[3] They resented fiscal preferences to the import of British goods, and deplored, as a threat to the numerical position of the true Afrikanders, a policy to encourage British immigrants. They looked forward to the ultimate ideal of an independent South African republic, or the re-establishment of the two former Boer republics. Some executive officials of the party helped to instigate the rebellion of 1914, hopeful that Great Britain's absorption in the struggles of Europe would restrain her from preventing the attainment of South African independence.[4] In 1919 Hertzog headed a delegation to the Peace Conference at Versailles in order to plead for self-determination by the Afrikander people.

The Nationalists met their first electoral test in 1915, when they obtained 26 seats, the Botha Government 54, and the Unionists 40.

[3]The incident is described by F. V. Engelenburg, *General Louis Botha* (1929), p. 244.

[4]Some of the instigators of the rebellion intended it merely to be a "gewapende protest" (armed protest) in the fashion of frontier Boers in the nineteenth century. For remarks on this subject, see Sir J. Percy Fitzpatrick, *South African Memoirs* (1932), p. 213.

Without a clear majority Botha for the duration of the war remained in power through the additional support of Unionists, Labour, and Independents. The Nationalists had thus leaped into the position of the official Opposition, and the succeeding years of stress quickened the growth of nationalist sentiment and strengthened the foundations of the party. On Botha's death, in 1919, it was inevitable that the electoral balance would shift further towards Hertzog and his followers. Hence Jan Smuts, succeeding to the leadership of the South African party, attempted to terminate the struggles over the national issue by a reunion with the Nationalists. The attempt was abortive owing to the stubborn republicanism of Nationalist leaders and Smuts's unshakable determination to accept neither a republic nor even a political party exclusively racial in character. Smuts promptly turned to the Unionists, who were thoroughly alarmed by the republican issue and ready to accept absorption within the South African party. The new political fusion resulted in a party national in the broadest sense, since it embraced virtually all the British electorate, except the section which supported Labour, combined with those Afrikanders who had stood by Botha and Smuts in opposition to the more uncompromising nationalism of Hertzog. Yet the event accentuated, instead of lessening, the bitterness of nationalist agitation. Smuts was denounced as a traitor to his race, and his opponents redoubled their efforts in promotion of a "two-stream" policy. In the rural parts they steadily increased their following, much of the post-war discontent of the platteland being diverted into nationalist clamour. Whereas in 1915 they had captured some 43 per cent of the rural vote; in 1920 they won some 65 per cent.[5] But for obvious reasons they could make no inroad in Natal, and many rural constituencies in the other provinces remained loyal to Smuts.

In 1924 the Nationalists finally achieved power, at the price of an alliance with Labour which restrained their more extravagant racialism, for Labour, with a leadership dominantly British, made it a preliminary condition that the ideal of secession must be put aside. Their energies were therefore directed to greater emphasis upon bilingualism, the special fostering of the Afrikaans language, the achievement of a national flag, and the widening of dominion status until it should mean virtual independence. In all these

[5] *Round Table*, X, p. 685.

matters Labour lent aid in return for social and industrial legislation. In one matter it was in enthusiastic unison with the Nationalists; viz., in measures designed to protect white labour from the competition of the black man. But the coalition did nothing to lessen the intensity of national passions, or to promote the broader concept of a nationality inclusive of the two white peoples. "The Dutch," remarked an observer, "now feel more Dutch, and the British more British, and both feel less South African."[6] Special bitterness between the two was generated by the controversy over the National Flag, for the British, however ready to make concessions in some important matters, were not prepared to see the Union Jack put in the discard. The agreement, reached ultimately in 1927, was the adoption of two flags.[7] The recognition of compromise dualities has almost become the conventional method in South Africa of easing the disintegrating tensions between the rival national groups.

The Nationalists retained office until, in 1933, in the depth of the world depression, grave economic conditions forced their leaders into coalition with the South African party, followed in the next year by a complete fusion under the title of the United party.[8] Hertzog remained Prime Minister, while his erstwhile opponent, Smuts, became Deputy Prime Minister. The event was then widely hailed as the most important step towards racial conciliation since Union. "More and more," remarked Smuts, "you see people fraternising and doing away with the dead racial issues of the past."[9] Briton and Boer met round the same council table to deal with an economic situation which affected them both. Discussion of a republic almost disappeared, and the mass of the Afrikanders seemed, with their leader, to be content with the status achieved in 1926 and in the Westminster Act. But events quickly illustrated that in South Africa the racial spirit is hard to down and the past is difficult to bury. Dr D. F. Malan, the most zealous of Nationalist leaders in the Cape, condemned fusion, and emulating the Hertzog of 1912 seceded with some followers to form a Purified Nationalist party. Thus the Boer continued to have defenders of his exclusiveness, and—ironically—most of them now were in the

[6]P. V. E. Evans, "Nationalism in South Africa" (*Nineteenth Century*, November, 1927).

[7]Act No. 40 of 1927.

[8]The complete title became the United South African National party.

[9]*House of Assembly Debates*, 1934, p. 2082.

rural Cape, instead of in the northern provinces where the Voortrekkers had settled and fought for independence.

The Purified Nationalists revived the well-tried appeals to the memories of the Afrikaans group, reverted to the ideal of a republic, once more talked in emotive terms of the sinister imperialism of Great Britain and the necessity of neutrality in any future war, and condemned liberalism in native policy, colour prejudices being always suitable for exploitation in South African politics. Some members, not a little influenced by events and thought in Germany, were emphatic in their anti-Semitism, demanding that further immigration of Jews into South Africa be stopped. Anti-Semitism was an innovation in Afrikander politics. In republican times the Jew was a stranger welcomed at the gate. Among Paul Kruger's closest friends were wealthy Jews. But the stress of new social circumstances and the penetration of ideas from abroad led the Purified Nationalists, in 1938, to embody in their platform the exclusion of future Jewish immigrants.[10] To the Black peril was added the Jewish menace.

As in the past, the chief strength of the Nationalist party is in the backveld, where changes in thought are slower and where the greivances of agrarian classes mingle readily with the traditional sentiments of the group. There the bogey words have long been "imperialism" and "capitalism." A recurrent attack is made on the political machinations, real and alleged, of mining magnates on the Rand. Much of the bitter feeling against the mining financiers springs from the general assumption that they are "foreigners" (i.e., British and Jews). After 1934 a frequent complaint was that the government specially favoured the capitalists by taxing lightly the mining companies, while it furthered the interests of imperialism by an alacrity in making commercial arrangements with the British Empire. Since the Witwatersrand was developed by foreign capital, three-quarters of the dividends, even as late as 1930, were paid abroad,[11] a fact which figured prominently in the rhetorical assaults of Dr Malan and his associates. The resolutions of the Imperial Conferences of 1926 and 1930, the Westminster Act, and the Status Act, measures which Hertzog looked upon as finally establishing the political freedom of the Union, were viewed by Malan and his followers as merely milestones to the assumed larger

[10] *Cape Times*, April 5, 1938.

[11] *Report of the Low Grade Ore Commission* (1932), para. 21.

freedom of a republic. They were confident of attaining their ultimate goal. As one of them remarked in the parliamentary debate on the Status Bill:

> If there is really to be race unity in South Africa we must ultimately be entirely free from the British Empire. I know it will be foolish to try to secede unless our English-speaking citizens concur in that respect, but inasmuch as true racial peace anyhow depends on it, I think that just as [they] have gradually reached to this position of acknowledging the sovereign independence of South Africa, they will also ultimately agree with us, and gradually come to the idea that a republic is the best form of government for South Africa.[12]

To this new nationalist agitation the most reasoned answers in parliament and on the platform came from the veteran campaigner for racial conciliation, Jan Smuts. "I have fought my battle," he said, "and I have made peace." His personal experience he wished to translate into the experience of the whole Afrikander people. The attainment of social peace required for two reasons the rejection of the republican ideal: the people of British extraction did not want it, and were not likely to want it in the future. To set it as the goal of a political party was merely to sustain racial irritations and split South Africa. Moreover, membership of the Empire involved no restraint on the genuine liberties of the Union; on the contrary, in the deeper sense it enlarged these liberties by providing association with other democratic communities to ensure world order. The practical statesman with a broad vision, whose *Weltanschauung* is that of Holism, saw a value in the Empire which escaped the grasp of exponents of a national particularism. To him it was a unique experiment in international government, from which South Africa must not separate herself. His faith in the union of the two peoples was that which he had shared with Botha in 1910: "Just as the English and the Scots came together, so shall we."

In addition to the Nationalists who declined to enter fusion in 1934, some English-speaking members of the South African party also revolted from their leader and, under Colonel Stallard, formed the Dominion party, with the slogan, "South Africa an integral and indivisible part of the British Empire." The occasion of this revolt was the Status Act, which, according to Colonel Stallard and his associates, went beyond the Statute of Westminster and threatened the prerogatives of the King and the unity of the Empire. Outside

[12] *Debates of the House of Assembly*, 1934, p. 2099. The speaker was J. G. Strydom.

Natal the party won little recognition, and some of its leaders, including Colonel Stallard, lost their seats in the general election of 1938. The broad fact is that, since the disappearance of the Unionists in 1920, the South Africans of British extraction have been reluctant to support a party with a racial appeal. Like the French in Canada they are conscious of their weakness as a minority, and see their vital interests best protected through co-operation with the less narrowly nationalistic of the Afrikanders.

Prior to the outbreak of war in September, 1939, the party under Dr Malan made little impression upon the electorate outside some rural areas. The fusion of 1934 had won powerful support, especially in the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. Even the most sanguine could not have expected the national issue to disappear, but there was promise that with the passing years it would become appreciably less significant, and that fusion in the white population would gradually penetrate deeper than party organization. But the outbreak of hostilities in Europe brought a quick resurgence in Afrikaans nationalism. The question now confronted the government whether it should implement the Nationalist arguments for neutrality or join Great Britain and the other oversea Dominions in the war against Germany. On this crucial issue the cabinet split. Hertzog was resolved to demonstrate that the status of the Union allowed neutrality. Five ministers supported him; Smuts and six other ministers favoured war. On the presentation of the two positions to the Assembly, that of Smuts was upheld by 80 votes to 67. Hertzog resigned, and Smuts formed a government with representatives from all political groups except the Nationalists. The division in parliament had followed the traditional lines of political geography in the Union: the representatives of the region that favoured Afrikander nationalism, embracing the western Cape, the Orange Free State, and north-western Transvaal, supported Hertzog; those representing the region that favoured a comprehensive South African nationalism, embracing the Cape peninsula, the eastern Cape province, Natal and the Witwatersrand, supported Smuts.

Hertzog and his followers inevitably drifted into collaboration with the Purified Nationalists, and in less than six months merged with them to form the Reunited Nationalist party (Herenigde

Nasionale), with partial recognition of a republican ideal.[13] Thus, thanks to the tensions created by war, South Africa was once more plunged into the turmoil of bitter nationalist controversy. Apart from the renewed emphasis upon the republic (Hertzog himself repudiated such an emphasis), nationalism came to be expressed in other forms which threatened to deepen cleavages, already serious within the community. For example, a National Economic Congress at Bloemfontein, in the autumn of 1939, declared in favour of organizing "Afrikander workers in Afrikander trade unions," and of directing "the purchasing power of Afrikanders towards Afrikander commerical, industrial and other enterprises." Indeed there was already in existence an Afrikander Trade Union movement.

But for many Nationalists the issue of a republic has been the central and enduring theme of discussion, for it can readily be made the basis of an appeal to the political romanticism which dwells in the mind of the ardent nationalist. The republic is simply the political symbol of the group's aspiration to be considered as a separate entity. *Die Transvaler*, the chief organ of advanced nationalism in the Transvaal, attempted to suggest the character of the future state:

> It will be a republic in which there will be no place for British public institutions. These things, which are foreign to the spirit and wishes of the Afrikander people, will be annihilated to the very foundations. It will be a republic with a government that is not subject to all sorts of foreign influences. General Smuts's holistic views, according to which the small Afrikaans culture must be dissolved in the great English culture, and South Africa be but a part of the great British Empire, will find no place in this Afrikaans republic. Mr. Hofmeyr's negrophilism and liberalism, which would wipe out all colour bars and would make the Afrikander a backboneless being, will have no place in this Afrikaans republic. Col. Stallard's imperialism, which would make South Africa subordinate in all respects to British interests, will have no place in this Afrikaans republic. Mr. Madeley's socialism, and conceptions of the Afrikaans people, will have no place in this Afrikaans republic. The spirit of people who are too afraid to speak about a republic, will also find no entry in this republic. In economic policy this republic will be no milch-cow of Britain. It will be a republic in which the Chamber of Mines will not have authority. It will be a republic built up on the ideals and views of such men as Piet Retief, Paul Kruger and Marthinus Steyn. . . .[14]

The significant element in this passage is the resort to the traditionalist thinking of the backveld, to the long and lonely brooding

[13]Hertzog has since resigned from the leadership of the new party, being out of sympathy with the republican ideas of other prominent members.

[14]Quoted in the *Forum* (Johannesburg), July 27, 1940.

of the Boer upon the heroes and incidents of his history. Like nationalist propaganda elsewhere, it is an appeal to a highly emotional interpretation of the past as a basis for present action. The Afrikander who wrote this editorial does not view the Empire as standing for democratic liberty but for conquest and exploitation. He remembers too vividly that the Second Boer War destroyed the independence and isolation of the Transvaal Republic; it broke the slow current of his people's life. He seeks separation from the Empire in order that Afrikanders may escape complete and humiliating assimilation to the political and social institutions of an alien nation.

Republicanism of a different kind is expounded by Oswald Pirow, a former minister in the Nationalist government. With him the influence is not the Afrikander's past, but Nazi Germany, for his emphasis falls on the "leader-principle," the purging of anti-national elements, discipline for the masses, and the abolition of parliamentary methods. Pirow, it may be added, is of German extraction. But only a portion of the Nationalist party subscribes to such revolutionary doctrine. The more realistic are convinced that a republic is impossible and indefensible unless supported by a substantial part of the English-speaking population of the Union. They repudiate the ideal of an exclusively Afrikander bloc, and favour a policy of conciliation on a nationalist basis. Significantly, in the platform of the Reunited Nationalist party loyalty to bilingualism was specified, with the obvious purpose of inducing English-speaking South Africans to co-operate in a common programme. But the pronounced emphasis upon the Afrikander tradition repels English-speaking South Africans; and few of them in the near future are likely to feel friendly to the idea of secession from the Empire. Their sense of tradition may be less articulate and ardent than that of Afrikanders, but is none the less deep, and irrespective of the material advantages involved, it is expressed in sentimental attachment to the imperial connection. Tradition for them has reference not merely to South Africa but to Great Britain. Only the destruction of the Empire as a consequence of war would reconcile them to republicanism, and leagued with them in this respect is a portion of the Afrikander population itself, derisively described by their opponents as "the loyal Dutch."

Significant among the influences fostering the national consciousness on which the political movement feeds, has been that of religious

leaders. Like the Roman Catholic Church in French Canada, the Dutch Reformed Church in the Afrikander community, although not the only religious body, has played a dominant role in sustaining a separate nationality; for generations it has exhorted its flock to hold fast to their cultural identity, and to let the past die hard. For the Nationalist party of today it provides from its clergy leaders of emotional power and integrity, like Dr D. F. Malan, and in its own ecclesiastical government it gives perennial guidance to the life of the group. This influential leadership of the church has been due to the relative isolation of the society, and the simplicity of the social structure, with family, church, and political organization supplying in the rural areas the sole forms of associational life. Olive Schreiner in her day remarked that "the parsonage and the church have been the social points round which the national life centred, and from which have radiated whatever of culture and social organization was attainable."[15] Among all portions of the population the influence of the church was profound. It commonly came closer than the state to the intimate lives of the people, and its functions were less ill defined. It preserved in use the Dutch language throughout the long period when in official matters Dutch was prohibited. Under its auspices social intercourse was fostered, education of an elementary kind was promoted, and the social cohesion of members of the group was invigorated, whence grew a national spirit. Even today among the poorer portion of the Afrikander population "organized community activities are unknown, except perhaps in religious matters."[16] To social problems, like that of "the poor whites," it draws public attention, and indeed on all questions of national concern its leaders speak with influence.

Of further major significance in determining the modern phases of Afrikander nationalism is the Afrikaans language. Its development as a vernacular distinct from High Dutch has the usual effect of a separate language in a nationality: it deepens the Afrikander's sense of belonging to a distinct community; it provides him with a linguistic symbol of his cultural identity. The literary development of the language is relatively modern. In its spoken form it goes back at least to the eighteenth century, but its literary form does not extend further back than the sixties of the last century. It has

[15]Olive Schreiner, *Thoughts on South Africa*, p. 277.

[16]*The Poor White Problem in South Africa*, Report of the Carnegie Commission, V, p. 26.

mainly developed since 1900, through the aggressive pressure of political and cultural associations, notably the Afrikaans Language Society, founded in 1905 to propagandize for Afrikaans as a literary language in preference to both Dutch and English. Broadly speaking, the Afrikaans Association and the South African Academy for Language, Literature and Art exerted an influence in the same direction. On the establishment of the Union, Dutch was recognized with English as an official language, enjoying equal rights and privileges.[17] The position of Afrikaans was not then strong enough to be substituted for Dutch, but subsequently its development as a literary medium was so rapid that, in 1917, it was resolved by parliament that "Dutch" should be interpreted as including Afrikaans. In 1925 the Act of Union was amended to make Afrikaans definitely one of the official languages, equal with English and Dutch. In the meantime it was spreading widely as a vehicle of literary expression. It came into the pulpit, whence for long it had been excluded. In 1916 the Dutch Reformed Church of the Free State and the Transvaal acknowledged it as an official church language. It has its popular press, lyric poets, and realistic novelists. Since 1914 it has been recognized as the medium of instruction in the primary schools of the Cape, the Transvaal, and the Free State, as also in many secondary schools and colleges. Chairs in Afrikaans exist in the universities. In 1933 an Afrikaans Bible appeared. Thus the Afrikanders have triumphed in asserting the status of their language, and the successful struggle, in the face of early ridicule, has, like similar movements in Europe, greatly strengthened that self-consciousness which finds expression in political nationalism. The language is the rampart of the nationality.

The more the distinct cultural life of the group is developed, the more difficult becomes a complete merging of Afrikanders and British into a common white South African population. But there are counter forces which foster such a merging, the most significant being the progress of industrialism and urbanization. In the past the preponderance of the Afrikander population has been rural; that of the British urban. As late as the census of 1926, 61 per cent of the male Afrikanders were rural and 39 per cent urban, while of the British 73 per cent were urban and 27 per cent rural.[18] As already mentioned, Afrikander nationalism has found its most

[17]South Africa Act, section 137.

[18]*U.G.* 4, 1931, p. 79.

ardent support among the dwellers in the country. But the drift of Afrikanders to the towns has two significant results: first, when uprooted from their traditional social environment they become more concerned with the issues of industrialism and less with those of domestic nationalism. They tend to become more unified in social consciousness with the British of their own class. Secondly, life in the towns commonly enlarges the opportunity for intermarriage with the British, which inevitably weakens among the children the sense of a distinct Afrikander stock. Thus urbanization, given time, will help to destroy those internal national cleavages which at present determine the alignments of political parties. Contributory to this development is bilingualism. The more truly bilingual is the population, the more certainly will the two groups assimilate. But in such cases time is a slow solvent, if a sure one.

THOMAS WOLFE: REALIST AND SYMBOLIST

E. K. Brown

WHEN two years ago last September Thomas Wolfe died at the age of thirty-eight writers and readers of his generation felt a grief that most of our elders have been unable to understand. The reason for our sense of loss was not simply a very real enthusiasm for what Wolfe had written, or even a conviction that he had within him many unwritten books such as no one else could write. It was, most of all, the curiously emblematic position Wolfe had come to hold and in which his death served to confirm him. He died of being Thomas Wolfe—the news reports spoke of pneumonia—of having lived, perceived, reflected, and composed with an intensity which would have killed most men ten times over. He had carried one mode of approaching the universe to the absolute.

One may put it in more matter-of-fact terms and say that it was his idea of the novel that killed him. The enormous books he published are but epitomes of those manuscripts with which he filled the office-ledgers which alone seemed to him capacious enough for his works. In his eerie essay *The Story of a Novel* he has told us that he wished to begin one of his novels with a sketch of a train-journey across Virginia; its function, he went on to say, was no more than "to introduce some of the chief characters, to indicate a central situation, to give something of the background from which the book proceeds, and perhaps through the movement of the train across the stillness of the earth to establish a certain beat, evoke a certain emotion which is inherent to the nature of the book." Here is what he intended his train-journey to do; in his ledgers it spread out to a length notably greater than an average novel's. Mr Whit Burnett malignantly remarks that "Wolfe rode up to his publisher's office in a truck with the manuscript of *Of Time and the River* . . . ; a couple of months later, after the ms. was cut he rode away in a much more nearly normal-sized taxicab." The reason for the truck myth was the unique fulness with which Wolfe presented his material; and the fulness derived from his peculiar theory of knowledge. To know anything about an object one must know everything about it, and knowing everything about it supposed knowing everything about its relationships. One experience to which he often returned seems at first very limited

and simple. "Some quiet steps that came and passed along a leafy night-time street in summer in a little town down South long years ago; a woman's voice, her sudden burst of low and tender laughter; then the voices and the footsteps going, silence, and the leafy rustle of trees." This incident—if one may call it so much as an incident—recurs in three of his four novels; to the end he is persuaded that he has not fathomed it. To do so would suppose fathoming the nature of that woman and her companions, of the town, of the wounded South, of the entire nation thirty years ago. . . . Nothing less would appease the curiosity of Wolfe. Hence the ledgers, hence the truck, hence death at thirty-eight. A novelist could not hold such a conception of knowledge and live.

The fall of 1940 has brought the second and last of his posthumous novels, *You Can't Go Home Again*.[1] Significant in many ways, it shows that Wolfe had clearly seen, at the end, that his formula for fiction was not viable. In all his earlier novels he tried to present life as a continuous process, the slave of time and memory; at the end he was willing to be representative, although he could never be brief. He would show the reef of love by a single party—it occupies almost half as many words as make up an average novel; two or three instances, varied in stress, set before the reader with immense detail, would show the reef of fame. As design the book may dissatisfy: it is rough and above all it is lumpy. Still it has a workable formula, and its roughness and lumpiness are accidental, and might well have disappeared in a second attempt.

Whatever may have been wrong with the formula on which his earlier novels were constructed—and it is on them, not on *You Can't Go Home Again*, that his reputation will chiefly rest—they had a fusion of qualities never even juxtaposed by any other American novelist of his time. Wolfe had the realist's regard for the particularity of a shape or a colour, a glance or a voice. His novels are thick with description. Set side by side Lewis's Gopher Prairie as Carol Kennicott finds it on her arrival from Minneapolis, and Altamont as Mr Gant finds it on his return from California; and one will perceive how much sharper is Wolfe's eye for appearances. He joined with this perceptive and devouring eye of the master-realist the imaginative symbolist's regard for relationships, occult and profound. In each generation he sought to uncover

[1]Harper, 1940.

the qualities of those before and those to come; all civilization he regarded as a natural unity to whose base he was always trying to dig. The main characters he drew were at once richly complicated human individuals who attracted the realist in him and also typical figures, often indeed gigantic symbols, of American life. His central character in the first two novels, Mr Gant, as well as having a variety of strongly marked simple aspects—those of the sordid drunkard, the master of invective, the wild foiled seeker after the meaning of his life—has the symbolic significance of nothing less than America itself. Wolfe often ran the gamut within a page or two from the accurate description of the slant of a roof, or the tone of a voice, to some desperate evocation of the meaning of a whole continent's life. Realism and imaginative symbolism he brought together within the roomy formula of autobiographical fiction. His conception of the novel led him to make his autobiographical presentation highly imaginative, to shape the progress of his book not by particular facts but by essential meanings. In such imaginative autobiography there was a place for all the instances of his sensitivity to appearances, and nevertheless the limits of realism could be transcended.

Most of Wolfe's achievements will come under view if one pauses over the three notions: realism, symbolism, roomy autobiography.

II

Wolfe writhed when he was called an autobiographical novelist, unless the term was applied in that most general (and meaningless) sense in which, as he thought, it might be applied to any creator. His dislike of the term had its taproot in the fear that the notion of autobiography would upset the delicate balance between realism and imaginative symbolism he sought to maintain and communicate.

He was astounded by the furore *Look Homeward, Angel* caused in his old home, Asheville, in North Carolina. "I had thought," he says, "there might be a hundred people in that town who would read the book, but if there were a hundred people outside the negro population, the blind, and the positively illiterate who did not read it, I do not know who they are." Asheville was indignant and "seethed with a fury of resentment which I had not believed possible." The clergy denounced it; the tea-parties buzzed with

horror and complaint; members of Wolfe's own family took to bed. The writer was threatened with immediate death if he were ever to return to the town; and one old woman whom he had known all his life wrote to warn him she would not lift a finger to prevent a mob from hauling his "big overgrown karkus" across the main square.

In Asheville's view the book was autobiography, cunningly spiced with lies. To support his claim that much of it was the fruit of a creative imagination, Wolfe points out that some of the incidents most boldly identified as records, or wilful distortions, of fact, had no source outside his imagination. Any reader of the novel will remember that the keeper of a local brothel bought the stone angel which for forty years had stood outside Mr Gant's shop, to set it at the head of a prostitute's grave. In the town's cemetery there was a statue of an angel, photographed when the novel came out, and widely circulated in the press. This angel stood over the grave of a pious church-working woman—and Wolfe had never seen it. Many of the facts which local readers of the novel related to the town's history were, Wolfe insists, as fully the creation of his imagination as the episode of the stone angel.

Such a disclaimer we may accept without surrendering a belief that the novels are essentially autobiographical. We know that his father was a stone-cutter; that Wolfe's life developed in the same fashion as that of the hero of the first two novels, Eugene Gant, and that of the hero of the two later, George Webber. But the main reason for accounting the novels autobiographical is something that we know of the temper of Wolfe's mind.

He had a very strong and very acute equipment for sense-experience. Like Webber he had "a good eye, a splendid nose, and the memory of an elephant." One of his habits, in preparing to write a novel, was to draw up "gigantic and staggering lists of the towns, cities, counties, states and countries I had been in, minutely thorough, desperately evocative descriptions of the under carriage, the springs, wheels, flanges, axle-rods, color, weight and quality of the day coach of an American railway train . . . , lists of the rooms and houses in which I had lived . . . with the most accurate and evocative descriptions of those rooms that I could write—their size, their shape, the color and design of the wall-

paper, the way a towel hung down, the way a chair creaked, a streak of water-rust upon the ceiling."

The magnificent result of such a preoccupation with sense-experience is shown in this passage which tells of the food at the Gant table:

> In the morning they rose in a house pungent with breakfast cookery, and they sat at a smoking table loaded with brains and eggs, ham, hot biscuit, fried apples seething in their gummed syrups, honey, golden butter, fried steak, scalding coffee. Or there were stacked batter cakes, rum-colored molasses, fragrant brown sausages, a bowl of wet cherries, plums, fat juicy bacon, jam. At the mid-day meal they ate heavily: a huge hot roast of beef, fat buttered lima beans, tender corn smoking on the cob, thick red slabs of sliced tomatoes, rough savory spinach, hot yellow corn bread, flaky biscuits, a deep-dish peach and apple cobbler spiced with cinnamon, tender cabbage, deep glass dishes piled with preserved fruits,—cherries, pears, peaches. At night they might eat fried steak, hot squares of grits, fried in egg and butter, pork chops, fish, young fried chicken.

Clearly the author of this passage has a need to recall the whole of his sensuous experience—he can be content with no typical representation. Nor can he be content with a dry catalogue: he must recall not only the objects of his experience, but also its quality in all its rich complexity. The power of so recalling experience is one of Wolfe's chief powers. It is also proof of the autobiographical tendency of Wolfe's mind. That food appeared on the Wolfe table in his childhood—who could doubt it?

III

The character who bestrides *Look Homeward, Angel* and a large part of its sequel is undoubtedly Wolfe's own father, put before us with all the resources of a realist. But Mr Gant is not only a remembered character, he is also the creation of a powerful symbolic imagination. The central idea of the sequel, *Of Time and the River*, Wolfe has himself described: "The deepest search in life, it seemed to me, the thing that in one way or another was central to all living, was man's search to find a father, not merely the father of his flesh, the lost father of his youth, but the image of a strength and wisdom external to his need and superior to his hunger, to which the belief and power of his own life could be united." Several elements in Wolfe's experience combined to lead him towards the father-image as the formative idea of his fiction. The power of atavism, with which he came to associate the father-image,

impressed him more and more as he matured; and he has given the closing chapters of his last work to an examination of its role in his own life, in that of the contemporary world, and in that of humanity as a whole. In some of the earlier novels important hints had been given: the enormous impact of the character of Wolfe's own father, the power over Wolfe's imagination of Joyce's exhibition of the father-image in *Ulysses*, long one of Wolfe's enthusiasms, but one which he was later to call in question. Still, it is in *You Can't Go Home Again*, sickened by the corruption of Germany under the Nazi régime, that he says his fullest and clearest say. Of the many significances that his title bears the deepest is the warning against atavism, man's greatest peril and one in which Wolfe thinks he was caught until he escaped in the last months of his writing life.

In Mr Gant, the perfect expression of the demonic in man, the realist and the symbolist have worked together within the formula of imaginative autobiography to reveal the whole force of Wolfe's characterizing power. The realist has a delighted awareness of the comic quality in his tirades of invective. At first glance such an outburst as this, which has to do with his wife's setting up a boarding-house, is the utterance of a spirit wounded beyond endurance: "Woman, you have deserted my bed and board, you have made a laughing stock of me before the world, and left your children to perish. Fiend that you are, there is nothing that you would not do to torture, humiliate and degrade me. You have deserted me in my old age; you have left me to die alone. Ah Lord, it was a bitter day for us all when your gloating eyes first fell upon this damnable, this murderous and bloody Barn. There is no ignominy to which you will not stoop if you think it will put a nickel in your pocket. You have fallen so low not even your own brothers will come near you. 'Nor beast nor man hath fallen so far.'" In the pantries and through the dining-room door the rich voices of the negresses chuckled, and one could hear them agreeing, "Dat man sho' can tawk!" Mr Gant knows he can talk; and when he is launched on such a tirade there is a nervous grin about his mouth: he enjoys delivering it, knows that his audience enjoys, and even expects, it, regarding it as ritual, integral to the day's routine as much as breakfast or dinner. In his anger he is always self-conscious.

His tirades are not, however, wholly comic: they are his means

of expressing his frustration and his resentments, his awareness of his tragic failure as a person. The tragic aspect of his tirades Wolfe's imagination seizes as a symbol of fury. Fury is one of the central conceptions in his theory of the universe, and singularly difficult to define. Wolfe does not attempt a definition: instead he writes page on page of wild and whirling words which disengage a strange music and from which emerges a fusion of the abstract idea fury and the symbol of fury—Mr Gant. When Mr Gant is at the point of death, pitifully weak, pathetically shrunk, Eugene appreciates what he is about to lose:

> Oh, to hear him prowling like a wakened lion below, the stertorous hoarse frenzy of his furious breath; to hear the ominous muttering mounting to faint howls as with infuriated relish he prepared the roaring invective of the morning's tirade, to hear him muttering as the coal went rattling out upon the fire, to hear him growling as savagely the flame shot up the trembling chimney-throat, to hear him muttering back and forth now like a raging beast, finally to hear his giant stride racing through the house prepared now, storming to the charge, and the well-remembered howl of his awakened fury as springing to the door-way of the back-room stairs he flung it open, yelling at them to awake. Was it in such a way, one time as he awoke, and heard below his father's lion-ramp of morning that fury came?

Fury came to Wolfe from many sources: but from none other so powerfully as from his father.

Mr Gant was cast in a huge mould, physically, emotionally, and in an elemental sense spiritually. Over the town of Altamont, in which he was forever a stranger, he cast a shadow. His howls and curses, his vast gestures and mercurial movements, his sprees, and his savage moulding of statues, impressed upon his townsmen the idea of "something strange and proud and glorious." Over his wife he also cast a shadow: when love and hate had both died down between them, what she felt was that beyond his cruelty and his folly there lay something glorious, in "the enormous beating color of his life and the lost and stricken thing in him which he would never find." Even in her dulled and miserly being "fear and a speechless pity rose when at times she saw the small uneasy eyes grow still and darken with the foiled and groping hunger of old frustration." Frustration in the central quest of his life is the key to Mr Gant's fury which at once sets him apart from his fellow-townsmen and gives them an imperfect awareness of a hidden affinity—of something in Mr Gant which is going beyond them on a path that they too ideally would follow.

By his intense emotionalism, his wild energies, his inarticulate awareness of a meaning in life which he cannot fathom, Mr Gant is raised into a symbol of the American adventure. Wolfe believed that there was a peculiar American tragedy, that on this continent life made specially heavy demands which man was specially inadequate to meet. At the end of *The Story of a Novel*, addressing himself in particular to artists, he tries to make plain the difficulty of American life. He repudiates the idea with which, as a contemporary of the "lost generation," he had once toyed: that the chief difficulty of the American artists lies in the national philistinism "which contends against the artist's life and which prevents his growth." He admits that in America more than anywhere else the artist assumes the heavy load of translating "the enormous space and energy of life" into "the structure of his own design," with but little help from any tradition or "antecedent scheme." Not even this load, heavy as it is, ranks as the American artist's chief impediment: that is the "labor of a complete and whole articulation, the discovery of an entire universe, and of a complete language." These are rather vague words and require close examination.

IV

About the problem of *language* but one observation need be made: the complete language desiderated will be simply the instrument for recording and communicating the universe discovered and the articulation achieved.

What is the *universe* the American artist is called upon to discover? It is the universe Mr Gant is straining to know, the universe Wolfe wore himself out in exploring.

What it is is most clearly suggested in the presentation of Eugene Gant's attitude towards his uncle Bascom Pentland. Bascom is, after Mr Gant, the most demonic male figure in the novels, but when he comes before us, even for the first time, he is in senile decay, and it is impossible to feel about him, as one feels about Mr Gant, that his personality is heroic. His function is to invite Eugene to recapture the past: in his senilities there are certainties of a past greatness of being and experience. As Eugene looks at him he has a "sense of union with the past"; but this sense is soon seen to be spurious, for in men like Bascom the past is dead: "they poured into our hands a handful of dry

dust and ashes." It was torture to Eugene to know that if one could rekindle in a man like Bascom Pentland the flame that had gone out forever one might reach to experiences otherwise as impossible to have as if they occurred only on the other side of the moon. Bascom was ten years old when the Civil War ended—the whole of the Reconstruction in Carolina was locked away in that mind: "he had heard the desolate and stricken voices in the South long, long ago, the quiet and casual voices of lost men, a million vanished footsteps in the streets of life." The man who would understand America, the American artist, undergoes his greatest tortures when he sits across from a Bascom Pentland and realizes the huge bulk of secrets slowly mouldering away to nothing within the old mind.

Wolfe had to endure torture of the same kind whenever he forgot an experience of his own and sought in vain to recapture its shapes and colours; and in Eugene's sense of frustration in revisiting Altamont this torture is exemplified. To his brother Ben he says in agony: "I have forgotten the old faces. Where are they, Ben? What were their names? I forget the names of people I knew for years. I get their faces mixed. I get their heads stuck on other people's bodies. I think one man has said what another said. There is something I have lost and forgotten." The need to hold all one's experiences fresh and complete in one's self at all times, the need to open communications with scores and thousands of other minds in order that their whole store of experience fresh and complete may become one's own also,—these are kindred needs. They point to a mind which supposed that the way to explore the entire universe lay through an accumulation of infinite fact, infinite experience, actual or vicarious.

All personal relationships Wolfe brought to one major test: what had the other person experienced and how much of his experience could he communicate? In *The Web and the Rock* he puts love itself to that test. In the earlier novels his treatment of love had been episodic, fumbling, and extremely shabby. The reader of *The Web and the Rock* knows why. Wolfe could love—in fact or in imagination—only when a woman could add to his store of vicarious experience as he had hoped that Bascom Pentland would add. None of the women in the earlier novels could do so. It is significant that his first striking portrait of a loved woman—Esther Jack, whom he sets beside his hero in *The Web*—is a person

much older than the man, much more travelled, more cultivated and involved in a criss-cross of intimate relationships with half the most interesting people in New York, where he is a stranger.

Before he knew Esther Jack, New York had been a daily torture to him. He had been appalled by "those terrible streets that had neither pause nor curve, nor any door that he could open." About him there were millions of faces, each of which revealed, or half-concealed, a consciousness, a multitude of experiences from which he was utterly excluded. Among a thousand alluring "images of glory, love, and power," he beat against the thin but immovable barriers, aware that he was "only a hand's breadth off from love, if he could span it, only a moment away from friendship if he knew it, only an inch, a door, a word away from all the glory of the earth, if he only knew the way." Esther Jack was the way; "the woman had come to represent the city to him. To him she was the city he had longed to know."

Her great fascination was the intensity with which she experienced the thousand particulars of her crowded New York life and the vivid fulness with which she reported them. What she told her lover he knew as if he had experienced it himself. He did not need to look about for the streets which still kept something of the appearance New York had had in her youth: through her he experienced the nineties. He did not need to dine with Morgans or Barrymores: she had done so and could tell him everything that was said, everything that was eaten or drunk, everything that was looked, in the course of those dinners. Through her miraculous precision and completeness in communication, her lover's quest of a full knowledge of America took its longest forward step. She helped him, more than anyone else he had ever known, to weave the web of illuminating experience: to put it brutally, she saved him time.

The relation between Esther and Webber had developed over more than a year before its undoing began. Her range of experience had been so rich, her hold on it was so firm, that Webber, absorbing that body of experience, was confronted with something stronger than he was. He became uncentred. "It seemed that he would never get her out of him again, never look out on life again with his own proper vision, never again distil out of his flesh and spirit the terrible invasions of love which rob men of . . . the soaring music of their isolation." To preserve "his own proper vision" he

breaks with Esther; the recognition that another's range of experience could be so rich and could be communicated so fully that it became a peril, not simply an opportunity, this was the most smashing blow that a man of Wolfe's temper could meet. He was so appalled by the proof of his weakness that he cursed his make-up because it could not perform "the inhuman task he set for it, hated it because its hunger could not match his hunger, which was for the earth and all things living in it." He had now to live with the knowledge that he must accept the limitations imposed upon him by the flaws and strains in his individual nature. He could console himself—but it was inadequate—in the assurance that "he had done all with his hunger and his flesh that one man could. And he knew also, although his bleared and battered face might seem to be the visage of a madman, the spirit that dwelt behind this ruined mask now looked calmly and sanely forth upon the earth for the first time in ten years." Such a recognition is the psychological end of *The Web and the Rock*.

The year 1940 has brought its sequel, telling what a man does when he has bought such bitter knowledge. Wolfe redefines the will's role in the individual's life. One cannot assimilate all: the will must be trained (and trusted) to determine what one shall try to assimilate. One must not be a blotter: the good life is one of conflict, in the service of loyalties chosen by the will. It had been Wolfe's belief that art could not properly be representative: the full record of one experience, he had thought, could not stand for a dozen distinct experiences, no matter how similar they might have been. Wolfe, at the end, recognized that his temperamental repudiation of the representative had been at the root of his difficulties as artist, and as person. He could admit it, but the tendency—the strongest if not the finest in his nature—was too strong to be dominated.

Still he did come to see quite early that if he could not describe America without reaching out for experience on all sides of his life and into all the lives he could touch, nevertheless the heaping up of experience brought one but a short way toward that "door" into the chamber of perfect awareness, of which, like Mr Gant, he was in quest.

It could bring one but a short way because the exploration of the universe through specific experiences, even in great number, leads only to fragmentary knowledge, and not to the *articulation*

which is the second phase in the artist's quest. The person with fragmentary knowledge will suffer from loneliness, the philosophical loneliness which a man may feel in the presence, or under the weight, of an unexplained universe. Such loneliness is in Wolfe's view specially the destiny of the American; and the frame of mind I am attempting to describe he has set forth in a meditation at the end of a passage in *Of Time and the River* where he has sought to record his knowledge of America: "And always America is the place of the deathless and enraptured moments, the eye that looked, the mouth that smiled and vanished, and the word; the stone, the leaf, the door we never found and never have forgotten. And these are the things that we remember of America, for we have known all her thousand lights and weathers, and we walk the streets, we walk the streets forever, we walk the streets of life alone." In this passage in which Wolfe records the loneliness so movingly, he points to the escape from it, the way to articulation. Throughout the first three novels, at least, as a refrain come the references, usually grouped as here, to "the stone, the leaf, the door."

V

These are three central symbols for the nature of life. And at this moment one turns wholly away from the realistic method, the method of faithfully recording experiences, to the method of the imaginative symbolist.

The *stone* is the angel which dominates not only the title but the text of the first novel. In his youth Mr Gant had seen in a Baltimore stone-cutter's shop a big marble angel, imported from Italy; and in "a cold and nameless excitement" decided that more than anything else he wished "to wreak something dark and unspeakable in him into cold stone." The carving in stone of an angel's head came to represent for him the full realization of the possibilities of life. He never learned to carve an angel's head: the big statue was sold to become a prostitute's memorial; and Mr Gant's energies waned until of all that huge and muscular body only the hands preserved their strength. When Eugene recalled his father, "he could remember nothing clearly except the powerful sculptured weight and symmetry of his tremendous hands as they lay folded on his body in the coffin." So completely is Mr Gant's quest of meanings symbolized in his carving that for his son those huge hands "seemed to rest there upon . . . the corpse

with a kind of terrible reality as if there really is, in death, some energy of life that will not die, some element of man's life that must persist, and that resumes into a single feature of his life the core and essence of his character." For Mr Gant the medium of stone which he had chosen for his grapple with the meaning of the universe was too resistant: the faculty within him on which he had staked all was too clumsy.

"All of our lives is written in the twisting of a leaf upon a bough, a door that opened, a stone." The symbol of the *leaf*, rather than any other of October's victims in the annual recurrence of death, presented itself to Wolfe through the poet whom beyond all others he admired. Coleridge, Eugene remarks in his Paris note-book, "is not one of the great English poets. He is The Poet." Elsewhere Wolfe quotes the image, already weighted with tragic meaning in Coleridge's use of it, of the leaf,

> The one red leaf, the last of its clan,
> That dances as often as dance it can,
> Hanging so light and hanging so high,
> On the topmost twig that looks up at the sky.

The leaf is allied with the constant reference to October which, as *Of Time and the River* proceeds, becomes a mighty chorus: October when life dries up even in Mr Gant whose vitality for so long seemed inexhaustible.

The *door*, the chief of the three symbols, is the thin barrier between personalities. It is to be remembered that for Wolfe personalities mattered not because of what they might in themselves be (it is doubtful if for him the conception of a personality as something in itself bore any clear sense) but because of the range of experiences which they had undergone, and might communicate. An individual is confined to a fragment of space and a moment of time: his continual need is to make at least a momentary escape through one of the doors that surround him. If he cannot go through all these doors—and ideally he would—he can perhaps go through the few which are most important for him, as the door leading to Esther Jack was for Webber, or the door leading to Bascom Pentland for Eugene.

We cannot often pass beyond such doors; the stone is too resistant for us to mould; the leaf dies too soon. Yet if we could know the content of many minds, if we could hold in all its freshness and completeness the whole of our experience, mould the stone,

keep the ichor of life flowing through the leaf, we could reach the doors, and they would open at our touch.

The use of such symbols, not spasmodically but throughout his fiction, enabled Wolfe to rise above the inadequate apprehensions of the universe open to him as a faithful realist. Through them he was often able to illuminate places which to the realist in him remained impenetrable. These symbols are securely rooted in his sensuous experience: they are not imposed from the intelligence, but impressed upon the perceptions. The reader of his novels, knows that they abound in sharp experiences of sculpture, trees, and entrances. What Wolfe was unable to clarify, either for himself or for his readers, was the exact mode in which he passed from the level of faithful realism to the higher, dimmer level of imaginative symbolism. His struggle towards clarification, both in the analysis of his own nature and in the presentation of relationships, is central to *You Can't Go Home Again;* but the success —and it is not complete—is bought at the cost of great emotional and sensuous impoverishment. He could not even then make the round of his own being. His loss is irreparable if one believes, as I do, that with time he could have achieved perfect clarification without important impoverishment. He would then have been the model—he is already the pioneer—of a profounder kind of fiction than America has yet had.

THE PATTERN OF MILTON'S *NATIVITY ODE*

ARTHUR BARKER

I

"THE Puritans," writes Professor Woodhouse, "(though in different degrees) were men who had undergone a religious experience, whose effect was to bestow a new unity of feeling upon their thoughts."[1] As he observes, this experience of a sudden renewal of spirit, mind and purpose, after confusion and paralysis of will, animated the apparently cold formulations of Puritan theology. Indeed, so important was it in the Puritan scheme that it inevitably received its own formulation, patterned on the experiences of Moses, Elijah, and St Paul, and vividly, yet still typically, presented in Bunyan's *Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners*. After a life of cynical carelessness, the sinner was oppressed by a terrifying sense of human corruption and of his own especial depravity; he contemplated with horrified fascination the torments to which he felt himself justly damned—a symbol of his torturing mental paralysis; he then began hopelessly to desire peace through God's mercy and to shift the weight of his oppression by striving to accept the divine will, whatever it might be; ultimately, if he were one of the chosen, the weight was removed by his recognition of the significance of Christ's incarnation and vicarious suffering, and he experienced a transporting illumination of spirit which neutralized his self-accusation and produced the calm certainty and the unity of purpose which made the Puritan a dangerous and inflexible opponent. From the moment of his illumination he dated his spiritual rebirth; and he might prove his claim to saintship (or be called upon to prove it) by giving an account of his experience and of the precise occasion on which he was illuminated.

Like so much in Puritanism, this process merely intensified an experience common in the seventeenth century. At a time of religious, intellectual, political, economic confusion, when the aspiring enthusiasm of the Renaissance had given place to the feeling (expressed by Donne) that man's world was "all in peeces, all cohaerance gone, All just supply, and all relation," it was

[1] *Puritanism and Liberty*, ed. A. S. P. Woodhouse (London, 1938), p. [38].

natural that many should escape from their oppressive sense of frustration by turning for reassurance and direction to a power beyond themselves, and that they should describe the renewal and re-integration of their energies in the terms employed by others during the decline of Jewry and later of Rome. If the experience was not always as sharply defined as the Puritan's conversion, it was nevertheless common to men as different as Bunyan and Donne himself. Donne's poetry is a record of his conversion; Walton took pains to emphasize the same pattern in the *Life of Herbert;* Henry Vaughan presented his variation in the preface to *Silex Scintillans;* the process carried Richard Crashaw to Rome. With the metaphysical poets, no less than with Bunyan, the experience was the prime source of inspiration; and it would not be too much to say that a conversion, in one form or another, lay behind most of the important literary products of the middle years of the century.

It is obvious that the greatest of the seventeenth-century poets shared this experience to some degree. Is it possible to be more precise and to point to some particular occasion when Milton experienced an illumination corresponding to the typical exaltation of the Puritan? Professor Haller thinks not: "We are not told in Milton's spiritual autobiography the precise moment when he first felt the conviction of grace. The sense of personal election seems to have been his from the start."[2] Certainly Milton seems never to have doubted his own importance; yet there is nothing in his poetry or prose before his twenty-first year which suggests that he found a deeply personal significance in the Puritan theory of election. In the prose of his middle period, however, he constantly uses the doctrines in which the Puritan formulated his experience, writing of the glorious privileges of the saints with enthusiasm, and (in the pamphlets of 1659 especially) of the "far surpassing light" of the Spirit with a depth of conviction comparable to Bunyan's. How were the formulae of theology thus animated for him? He nowhere describes an experience precisely like the typical conversion of the tinker. Nothing in his youth exactly corresponds to the depravity Bunyan emphasized; it is difficult to believe that he ever trembled at the thought of the punishments of the damned;

[2]William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism* (New York, 1938), p. 297.

and, however else his self-esteem was expressed, he never described himself, with Bunyan and Cromwell, as "the chief of sinners." Yet he repudiated (though he printed) the more sensuous of his early poems;[3] and the Hell of *Paradise Lost* is the product of a vivid sense of evil which expresses itself throughout his works. His life was no fugitive and cloistered serenity, but a series of frustrations both private and public. His Puritan contemporaries found a constant source of reassurance in the fruits of their religious experience; he found a similar source in the genius which enabled him to rise imaginatively above despair. In that fact lies the explanation of the sense of personal election which he shared with them.

The autobiographical passages Professor Haller seems specially to have in mind are those in the pamphlets of 1641 and 1642 in which Milton defends his right, though a layman, to meddle in ecclesiastical matters.[4] Somewhat incongruously, they deal chiefly with his poetical development and plans; but the incongruity is only apparent since he regarded himself by then as a poet-prophet of special calling, whose inspiration was from God. This conviction is, as Professor Hanford remarks, "the centre of his spiritual biography."[5] But it was not his from the start; it is not suggested in his poetry or prose before 1629; and its impact on his imagination is the experience which corresponds to the conversion of his Puritan associates. The moment of impact is fixed by his *Ode on the Morning of Christ's Nativity*, composed in December, 1629, near his twenty-first birthday. This poem strikes a note altogether new in his poetry, includes an implied rejection of his earlier manner,[6] and records a vision which produced a confident and harmonious purposefulness by overcoming the forces of gloom and confusion. It is to be regarded as the testimony of Milton's religious experience, but with this difference, that he thenceforth thought of himself not simply, like Bunyan, as a saint but as a poet sacred to the gods and their priest, whose inmost soul and lips breathe

[3] In the lines appended to *Elegia Septima* in the 1645 edition of his *Poems*.

[4] Especially *Reason of Church Government*, *Works* (Columbia), III, pp. 235-9; and *Apology*, *Works*, III, pp. 301-7.

[5] "Milton's Mosaic Inspiration" (UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO QUARTERLY, VIII, p. 147).

[6] The first stanza of "The Hymn" clearly refers to the sensuous imagery of *Elegia quinta*, *In adventum veris*.

out Jove.[7] For the experience which produced the *Ode* was unlike Bunyan's in being essentially aesthetic. I propose to show that the recognition of the significance of Christ's incarnation and sacrifice recorded in the *Ode* was coupled with a recognition of the potentialities of a peculiarly complex poetical symbol, and that these recognitions together bestowed a new unity of feeling upon both Milton's thought and his art.

II

Milton emphasized the importance of his *Ode* by setting it at the beginning of the section devoted to English verse in the *Poems* (1645). *Lycidas* (November, 1637) concluded this section, and clearly marks the end of a period in Milton's development of which the *Ode* is the beginning. Hitherto Ovid had been his chief model; after 1629 his tone was more severe. He noted this departure in an account of his development written in 1642,[8] and more significantly in *Elegia Sexta*, composed shortly after the *Ode*, when he spoke for the first time of the rigorously disciplined virtue required of the poet who would write of cosmic and epic themes, and referred to his Nativity poem as, by implication, an earnest of his intentions.[9]

The self-dedication of the *Ode* and the *Elegy* have often been noted;[10] the nature of this dedication has not, I think, been precisely explained because the quality of Milton's art in the *Nativity Ode* has not been fully comprehended. Its charm and freshness have been praised, but (apart from a few lines of swelling grandeur) it has been said to lack the distinctively Miltonic excellences so fully apparent in *Lycidas*. Mr Tillyard, for example, thinks *Lycidas* "one of the greatest poems in English"; but he finds the *Ode* less satisfactory since, though it has a "beautiful diversity," its heterogeneous elements are only "harmonized by a pervading

[7] *Elegia sexta*, ll. 77-8, translated.

[8] *Apology*, *Works*, III, p. 303.

[9] *Elegia sexta*, ll. 55 ff. He had already expressed his ambition to write upon such themes in *At a Vacation Exercise*, but without speaking of the required discipline.

[10] See J. H. Hanford, "The Youth of Milton" (*Studies in Shakespeare, Milton and Donne, University of Michigan Publications, Language and Literature*, I, pp. 122-4); E. M. W. Tillyard, *Milton*, pp. 35-42; W. Haller, *op. cit.*

youthful candour" and superficially unified by the fact that at the beginning Milton hastens to prevent the Wise Men whose arrival (as he thinks) is indicated at the end.[11] The impression made on my mind by the *Ode* has, however, a unity which could not be produced simply by a pervasive charm or the provision of a frame for the picture. In this respect it is not unlike the impression created by *Lycidas*. I believe one can show how Milton's architectonic power is exerted with impressive results in both poems, and how in the case of the *Ode*, as more obviously in *Lycidas*, its influence helps to define mood and significance.

Since *Lycidas* is in many respects the type in little of Milton's peculiar genius, it provides a suitable standard for judging the earlier *Ode*. As Mr Tillyard has made clear, the elegy is essentially a personal poem, the ostensible subject making possible the resolution of the emotional problems created by Milton's disciplined devotion to poetry.[12] Like his great poems, it performed a cathartic function for the poet himself, was indeed the very process through which a balanced calm was brought out of emotional disquiet. The achievement of this calm is expressed through the poem's achievement of a symmetry of structure which Mr Tillyard might have emphasized more heavily. Dr Johnson recognized the excellence of "the design" in *Paradise Lost*, but he was prevented from discerning the same quality in *Lycidas* by what seemed to him the trivial character of the pastoral fiction. It is just Milton's balanced manipulation of this convention to throw into relief the resolution of his own problems, which gives the poem its serene power.

Lycidas consists of an introduction and conclusion, both pastoral in tone, and three movements, practically equal in length and precisely parallel in pattern. Each begins with an invocation of pastoral muses (ll. 15, 85, 132), proceeds with conventions drawn from the tradition of the pastoral elegy (the association of the lamented and the poet as shepherds, the mourning of nature, the

[11] *Op. cit.*, pp. 37, 85. Similarly G. W. Knight (*The Burning Oracle*, 1939, p. 64) thinks the *Ode* "somewhat fluid in its addition of stanza to stanza: there is no complex inter-knitting, that is, of central action with design, nor is such necessary." A similar failure to recognize the design of *Lycidas* leads Professor Knight to describe that poem as "an accumulation of magnificent fragments" (p. 70).

[12] *Op. cit.*, pp. 80-5.

questioning of the nymphs, the procession of mourners, a flower passage,[13] and the reassurance), and ends with the formulation and resolution of Milton's emotional problem. The first movement laments Lycidas the poet-shepherd; its problem, the possible frustration of disciplined poetic ambition by early death, is resolved by the assurance, "Of so much fame in heaven expect thy meed." The second laments Lycidas as priest-shepherd; its problem, the frustration of a sincere shepherd in a corrupt church, is resolved by St Peter's reference to the "two-handed engine" of divine retribution. The third concludes with the apotheosis, a convention introduced by Virgil in *Eclogue* V but significantly handled by Milton. He sees the poet-priest-shepherd worshipping the Lamb with those saints "in solemn troops" who sing the "unexpressive nuptial song" of the fourteenth chapter of *Revelation*. The apotheosis thus not only provides the final reassurance but unites the themes of the preceding movements in the ultimate reward of the true poet-priest.

It is the cumulative effect of its three parallel movements which makes *Lycidas* impressive; the return to the pastoral at the beginning of each makes possible three successive and perfectly controlled crescendos. The gathering up of the first two in the last gives the conclusion its calm finality; and the balanced unity of the design appropriately represents the calm achieved through the resolution of emotional conflicts. The problems are solved for Milton by the apotheosis because he regards himself as a poet-priest who can hope that his "destin'd urn" will bring the same reward.

The *Nativity Ode* resolves no pressing problems, but it expresses profound feeling and calm determination in much the same way as *Lycidas*. It seems architectonically inferior because its parts are not held together by the same strictness of formal design. But it produces a unified impression because it is built upon another kind of design. The four introductory stanzas apart, and

[13]Mr Tillyard, finding it "difficult to describe the function" of this passage (ll. 133-64), regards it as a transitional interlude, the third movement of the poem beginning with line 165. But the invocation of Alpheus in line 132 clearly marks the beginning of a third movement, and the flower passage performs for this movement exactly the same function as the similarly conventional passages of the preceding movements.

the brief conclusion, it too consists of three equal movements, held in relation, not by the repetition of a structural pattern, but by the variation of a basic pattern of imagery. The first eight stanzas of the "Hymn" describe the setting of the Nativity, the next nine the angelic choir, the next nine the flight of the heathen gods. The conclusion, the last stanza, presents the scene in the stable. A brief analysis will show that the three movements each present a single modification of the simple contrast, preserved throughout the poem, between images suggesting light and harmony and images of gloom and discord.

The Nativity setting is described in a series of negatives whose effect is to reduce light and sound to a minimum while subduing all discordant elements. There is no colour because Nature has "doffed her gaudy trim" and covered her face with "a veil of maiden white."[14] Peace has stilled the din of war; the air is "gentle"; the winds "smoothly the waters kiss't" while "birds of calm sit brooding on the charmed wave." The scene is dimly lit by the "glimmering orbs" of the stars standing "fixt"; the sun (as we are told in the first and seventh stanzas) withholds his "inferior flame." The eighth stanza completes this peacefully hushed and faintly illuminated scene by introducing the shepherds "simply chatting in a rustic row." It also serves as a link with the second movement, for there breaks upon their ears, with a suddenness for which the poet has carefully prepared, the enrapturing harmony of the angelic choir:[15]

> When such music sweet
> Their hearts and ears did greet,
> As never was by mortal finger strook,
> Divinely-warbled voice
> Answering the stringed noise,
> As all their souls in blissful rapture took:
> The air such pleasure loath to lose,
> With thousand echoes still prolongs each heav'nly close.

The harmony is such as might bind heaven and earth "in happier union"; and it is accompanied by an intense but not formless brilliance—"a globe of circular light"—revealing the

[14]The unhappy personifications of Peace and Justice contain the only touches of colour in the first two movements.

[15]Milton wisely omits the announcement of Luke's single angel which would have reduced the sharpness of the contrast.

angels "in glittering ranks." This association of light with harmony and order is emphasized in the succeeding verses with reference first to *Job* 38.7, and then to the Pythagorean music of the spheres. The music is such as was heard "when of old the sons of morning sung" and God, setting his constellations in the heavens, brought order out of chaos in creating the "well-balanc't" world. The "crystal spheres," representing the order of nature, are urged to ring out their ninefold "silver chime" to "make up full consort to the angelic symphony." The possible effect of the harmony on men is elaborated by the two following verses in terms of light: "the age of gold" may return, and "speckl'd vanity" and "leprous sin" give place to Mercy, "thron'd in celestial sheen," and Justice, wearing "th' enamel'd arras of the rainbow."

This vision is dissipated by the thought of the Cross, and the movement comes to an end with a reference to the last judgment which prepares for the third movement by introducing ideas of dissonance and gloom in sharp contrast with the harmony and order of the second. The trump of doom must "thunder" with "a horrid clang" such as was heard amid the "smouldering clouds" of Sinai, and with a "blast" shaking the earth "from the surface to the centre."

The last movement is full of discordant sounds, distorted forms, and shadows. The old dragon thrashes with his "folded tail"; one hears the "hideous hum" and "hollow shriek" of the oracles, and "a voice of weeping" and "loud lament"; with "flow'r-inwoven tresses torn" the nymphs sorrow in "twilight shade of tangled thickets"; the lars and lemurs "moan with midnight plaint"; "a drear and dying sound" affrights the flamens; Moloch leaves his "shadows dread" and "burning idol all of blackest hue." "The rays of Bethlehem" blind the gods, and the Babe can "control the damned crew."

Light and order return with these phrases, and gloom and confusion make way for them as the "shadows pale" disperse and the fairies leave "their moon-lov'd maze." The poet strives for striking brilliance through the unhappy image of "the sun in bed" which, if less clumsy, would have reminded the reader that day-break was withheld in the opening movement. Even so, the verse prepares for the final picture of the nativity:

But see! the Virgin blest,
Hath laid her Babe to rest.
Time is our tedious song should here have ending;
Heav'n's youngest teemed star
Hath fixt her polisht car,
Her sleeping Lord with handmaid lamp attending:
And all about the courtly stable,
Bright-harness'd angels sit in order serviceable.

This scene has often been compared with the simply but definitely composed fifteenth-century nativities; but its effectiveness depends on more than its own composition. It catches up the pattern underlying the preceding movements, bringing order after confusion and reflecting the peaceful hush and the brilliant harmony of the first two movements. It is pervaded by the clear and steady brilliance of the new star's "handmaid lamp," and enclosed by the "order serviceable" of the "bright-harness'd angels." Its static quality fixes with appropriate firmness the pattern of light and harmony on which the poem has been composed.

The effect of the *Nativity Ode* is thus produced by its reiteration of a pattern of imagery, variously presented in the three movements, and impressed with finality in the concluding verse. The balanced contrast between the first and third movements serves to throw the central movement into sharp relief. This emphasis defines the poem's significance for Milton. It was at about this time that he was, in his own phrase, "confirmed in this opinion, that he who would not be frustrate of his hope to write well hereafter in laudable things ought himself to be a true poem; that is, a composition and pattern of the best and honourablest things. . . ."[16] The *Nativity Ode* is his first achievement of composition and pattern in the full Miltonic sense, and it is so because it expresses his achievement of composition and pattern in himself through the harmonious illumination resulting from his recognition of the significance of the Incarnation. It is the first of Milton's inspired poems; and the angelic choir is the symbol of his inspiration.

III

The imagery of the *Ode* is of course no more original than the pastoral conventions of *Lycidas*.[17] The effect again depends on

[16] *Apology*, *Works*, III, p. 303.

[17] See the annotations by Verity (Pitt Press Series), Hughes (*Paradise Re-*

Milton's handling of traditional elements. The emphasis on the intense brilliance and divine harmony of the angelic choir has in itself no peculiar personal significance, for it was a commonplace in seventeenth-century poetry—to go no farther. Milton knew, for example, Giles Fletcher's reference, in *Christ's Victorie in Heaven*, to the time

> When, like the starres the singing angels shot
> To earth, and heav'n awaked all his eyes
> To see another sun at midnight rise
> On earth.

Nearly the whole of Milton's conception is implicit in these unmusical lines; but they are not a source, for the ideas were simply part of the consciousness of a century whose metaphysics were shot through with symbolic light. They occur repeatedly in the work of poets who neither knew Milton nor were known to him in 1629. George Herbert concluded his second *Christmas* with a typically metaphysical association of the sun and harmony:

> His beams shall cheer my breast, and both so twine,
> Till even his beams sing, and my music shine.

His mystically-minded disciple, Henry Vaughan, used the idea of nature's harmony in *The Morning Watch:*

> Thus all is hurl'd
> In sacred hymns, and order, the great chime
> And symphony of nature. Prayer is
> The world in tune.

Richard Crashaw made the idea that the Nativity was the "bright dawn of our eternal day" the centre of *In the Holy Nativity*, and his *In the Glorious Epiphany* associated harmony with light through the idea that the sun is symbolic of the sin which prevents man from hearing the heavenly music:

> This daily wrong
> Silenc't the morning-sons, & dampt their song.
> Nor was't our deafness, but our sins, that thus
> Long made th'harmonious orbes all mute to us.

These examples will suffice to indicate that Milton's imagery is not unique, and also to suggest what I believe could be proved by an extensive examination of seventeenth-century poetry, that none of his contemporaries developed the idea and its varied

---

gained . . . , Minor Poems), and Cook (*Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, XV, pp. 307-68).

associations with anything like the controlled complexity of the central passage of the *Ode*. Behind the symbol of the choir and the spheres lies an intricate fusion of traditions. The connection of angels with stars is suggested by such passages as *Revelation* 9.1, 11; 12.4; *I Kings* 22.19; *Judges* 5.20. It also owes much to the Greek idea, recorded by Plato (*Republic* 621B) and Aristotle (*Nicomachean Ethics* 6.7), and frequently employed by Milton's former model Ovid, that the stars are divine beings. This leads inevitably to the association of the songs of praise sung by the angels in heaven with the music of the spheres (as in Crashaw), the bringing together of passages like *Job* 38.7, and the Pythagorean doctrine expressed, for example, by Plato (*Republic* 617) and by Cicero (*De re publica*, 6.17, 18). Nine was the number of spheres usually given (as by Cicero). This is the number of the Muses, identified by Plutarch with the spheres (*Symposium* 9). The Muses can thus be connected with the angels, who (according to Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite) are divided into nine orders. Moreover, the music of the spheres is represented by the pipe of Pan, who is in love with Echo, another symbol of the music. Pan is sometimes identified with the universe, sometimes with the sun; and he is a shepherd who controls the flocking stars and preserves their harmony. The early Christians associated Pan with Christ, as does Milton in the eighth stanza of the *Ode*; but the full significance of Milton's association is only apparent from the description of the choir which follows. Christ is the reason for the angelic music and the source of the music of the spheres, which, at his birth, should harmonize with the choir and produce in men the harmony of their first perfection. These harmonies are not only described but echoed in Milton's verse. Of the music of the spheres Cicero wrote: "Some learned men, by imitating this harmony with strings and vocal melodies, have opened a way for their return to this place; as all others have done who, endued with pre-eminent qualities, have cultivated in their mortal life the pursuits of heaven."[18] This becomes the function of Milton's verse for the first time in the *Nativity Ode*; and the incarnate Christ is not only the subject of his poem, but the source of his inspiration.

It is thus the symbol of illumination and harmony provided

[18] *De re publica*, 6.17; see S. G. S. Spaeth, *Milton's Knowledge of Music*, appendix v.

by the choir and the spheres which fuses the heterogeneous particles of the *Ode* and gives it its controlled power. It does so because it enables the poet to draw on a vast reservoir of pagan and Christian suggestion while transcending the conflict between the two traditions, and consequently to express something approaching the totality of his literary experience. The fruit of this experience is his sense of divine inspiration. From "the Samian teacher"[19] he had learned of the stern discipline required of the poet who would reproduce the music of the spheres; for the Christian the aim of such discipline must be to echo the angelic hymn of communion with God through the incarnate Christ. The central symbol of the *Ode* represents the achievement of this inspiring communion.

IV

It is significant that there is no reference to the celestial music in Milton's poetry before 1629. His attention seems to have been drawn to it when he had to compose his second academic prolusion. Here he examines the opinions of Plato and Aristotle on the Pythagorean allegory, and observes: "Hence arose the story . . . of how the Muses dance before Jove's altar day and night; hence too the attribution to Phoebus . . . of musical skill. Hence the belief . . . that Harmonia was the daughter of Jove and Electra, and that at her marriage to Cadmus all the choirs of heaven sang in concert."[20] The mythological references to God, the sun, harmony, and light, suggest that this is the germ from which the *Ode*'s pattern developed; its significance is indicated by the assertion that man cannot hear the music because "the presumption of that thief Prometheus" has left him "buried in sin," though "if our souls were pure, chaste, and white as snow . . . , then indeed our ears would ring and be filled with that exquisite music of the stars in their orbits; then would all things turn back to the age of gold, and we ourselves, free from every grief, would pass our lives in a blessed peace. . . ."

[19]Pythagoras, *Elegia sexta*, l. 59.

[20]*Milton: Private Correspondence and Academic Exercises*, trans. P. B. Tillyard, p. 66. The prolusion cannot be dated, but since Milton placed it second in the group it probably belongs to the beginning of his Cambridge career. Its connection with the *Ode* leads E. M. W. Tillyard to place it about 1629 (*ibid.*, pp. xxvi-xxix).

The force with which this idea struck Milton's imagination is indicated by the fact that from the *Ode* to *Lycidas* he was almost incapable of writing on a serious subject without introducing the music. *Il Penseroso* echoes the phrasing of his prolusion; *The Passion* and *Upon the Circumcision* begin with references to the music of the *Ode*. *At a Solemn Music* is constructed upon its central conception, with this significant variation, that the place of the Nativity angels is taken by the hundred forty and four thousand "not defiled with women," who sing before the Lamb in *Revelation* 14. In 1642 Milton recorded the impression made on his youthful mind by this passage.[21] Its song provided a more suitable angelic counterpart for the music of the spheres than the Nativity choir since the latter belonged to a particular occasion while the former was constant. In *Arcades* "the celestial siren's harmony" marks the climax of the speech of the Genius, though there is no reference to its scriptural counterpart. Superficially this is also true in *Comus*; but the Renaissance habit of speaking of God and Christ in mythological terms indicates the significance of the prologue's opening lines and of the epilogue's exhortation to love virtue since

> She can teach you how to climb
> Higher than the sphery chime.

Finally in *Lycidas* the destiny of the poet-priest is fulfilled as he hears "the unexpressive nuptial song" sung by

> all the saints above,
> In solemn troops, and sweet societies,
> That sing, and singing in their glory move.

This is the appropriate resolution of the problems involved in the elegy's lament; for in his youthful defence of poetry, *Ad Patrem*, Milton envisaged for himself and his musical father the same reward: "When we return to our native Olympus . . . we shall walk . . . through the temples of the skies, and with the harp's soft accompaniment we shall sing sweet songs to which the stars shall echo and the vault of heaven from pole to pole. Even now the fiery spirit who flies through the swift spheres is singing his immortal melody and unutterable song in harmony with the starry choruses."[22]

[21] *Apology*, *Works*, III, p. 306.

[22] Hughes' translation, ll. 30-7. Cf. the apotheosis of Diodati in *Epitaphium Damonis*.

This is the reward of the poet who seeks his inspiration from the "Heav'nly Muse" of the *Ode*'s introductory verses.[23] Here Milton calls on his muse to present a gift to the Christ who has laid aside "that glorious form, that light unsufferable," and to prevent with her offering the star-led wizards:

> Have thou the honour first, thy Lord to greet,
> And join thy voice unto the angel quire,
> From out his secret altar toucht with hallow'd fire.

This hallowed fire from God's altar, about which the angelic muses eternally sing and singing in their glory move like stars, is the fire with which the seraph touched the lips of the prophet Isaiah.[24] The product of this inspiration is the glorious form and light unsufferable of the symbol thrown into relief by the patterning of the *Ode* whose beauty surpassed anything Milton had hitherto written because it expressed with perfect adequacy and complete control a new and profound religious emotion. Like that Englishman of whom Bede tells "a marvellous and very pleasant anecdote," Milton "suddenly by an act of God became," not simply "a poet," but a poet with a peculiar purpose and peculiar gifts.[25]

It was this experience, at once aesthetic and religious, which crystallized Milton's conviction of special poetical calling and provided him with a definition of his function. Its effects correspond in general to the effects of the Puritan conversion. He then determined to forsake the ways of his youth and (as *Elegia sexta* implies) the masters of the *elegia levis*; the new pattern imposed on his thought and feeling drove out these masters as the Babe drove out the pagan gods. But as his experience was essentially aesthetic and immediately produced the harmonies of the *Ode*, so it differed from the experience of his Puritan contemporaries in involving a recognition, not only of the personal significance of the Incarnation, but also of its relationship to the classical and humanistic doctrine of harmonious perfection symbolized by the music of the spheres. Of this perfection divinely inspired poetry seemed

[23]On the Renaissance identification of the muse of astronomy with the Holy Spirit as the inspirer of Christian poets, and on the place of Milton's *Paradise Lost* invocations in this tradition, see Miss L. B. Campbell, "The Christian Muse" (*Huntingdon Library Bulletin*, 8).

[24]Cf. *Reason of Church Government*, *Works*, III, p. 241.

[25]Translation of a Latin note in Milton's Commonplace Book, *Works*, XVIII, p. 139.

to him the supreme expression. Thus the *Ode* helps to explain the enthusiasm with which he found in the Calvinistic doctrine of grace a satisfactory expression of his sense of peculiar calling, and also his devotion to the ideal of a harmonious society reproducing "the old and elegant humanity of Greece." The delicate balance represented by the *Ode*'s central symbol was difficult to preserve; but the main effort of his life was directed towards its preservation in himself and its reproduction through poetry and in the life of men. When his efforts for society were frustrated and he himself was cut off by blindness, it was to the far surpassing light of his inspiration that he turned for the harmony of spirit expressed in the Christian doctrines and the classic composition and pattern of his great poems.

ON A CERTAIN REVIVAL OF ENTHUSIASM

F. H. Anderson

I CONSIDER it my good fortune to receive for review Professor W. W. Bryden's *The Christian's Knowledge of God*.[1] Because, in the first instance, this work is concerned in a measure with Christian epistemology, a field which suffers but scanty and infrequent cultivation. And, secondly, the book is written with unflagging vigour, much erudition, and an adroit mastery of words. It sustains with striking consistency a thesis difficult to state and expose within the framework of logical propositions. And it abounds in trenchant criticism of facile interpretations of Christianity: blatant writers "full of noisy, catchy phrases" come in for rebuke, as well as preachers of quieter mien who teach "a church calculated to become . . . scarcely more than an educational, social, and humanitarian institution." Professional theologians who talk glibly of "rational faith" will find within its pages cause for much reflection, as will their amateur disciples who are wont to undertake juvenile pilgrimages "through Science to God."

But my immediate reason for enjoying this work is, I must confess, personal. It so happens that its pages throw much light on recently read writings of the seventeenth century: so much so that I am inclined to regard it as one of the most vivid commentaries I have yet met with on certain debatable questions of post-Reformation thinking—even though, as I recall, no references are made to this period in the book itself, which contains, incidentally but an occasional, fugitive reference to the Reformation. Perhaps, therefore, Professor Bryden will not object to my approaching his argument by way of a consideration or two concerning seventeenth-century thought.

I

Post-Reformation England witnesses an intense revival of interest in Patristic, as distinct from Scholastic, literature. Between the years 1475 and 1640 no less than fifty-six titles, some of them elaborately edited, of "that mirror of religion and learning, Saint Augustine," are published in England; and during the same

[1] *The Christian's Knowledge of God*, by W. W. Bryden, Thorn Press (Toronto), xiv, 266pp. ($2.50)

period—if we may accept the findings of the editors of the *Short Term Catalogue*—not a work of St Thomas Aquinas comes off an English press. Reasons for the reading of the Fathers are not difficult to find. To begin with, the teachings of the Church of Rome are set forth in the terms of scholastic learning; and the Reformed Church desires a theology which is distinctive in both content and form. Moreover, in seeking a continuity of doctrine within a continuous Church, Protestant theologians turn to the writers of the earlier Church as teachers more authoritative because nearer in time to its Founder. But no less important is a third reason: many, if by no means all, within the Reformed Church see the Kingdom of God primarily as something which is within the hearts of men rather than in ecclesiastical organizations, orders, and teachings. Some go so far as to deny the presence of revelation and its counterpart, faith in promulgated doctrines, offices, fastings, and hearings, and regard them both as a unique, personal experience of a literally *enthusiastic* union with Christ.

Those who, as true Enthusiasts, accept the doctrine of a continuous personal revelation are by no means agreed, however, on the portrayal of God's presence to the man of faith. For some the Divine Nature which is present in the act of saving and sustaining Grace is cognitively recognizable through the thought of rational man; and, since cognitively perceivable, capable of intelligible statement and communication. Others believe that the nature of revelation, or its counterpart, faith, because of a uniquely immediate, private character, is rationally unintelligible and incommunicable in the form of logical propositions. Indeed those of the latter type rejoice in "mysteries, and paradoxes, and senseless propositions"; they boast of their damning and despising everything that can be "understood," as the evil fruit of "carnal reason"; in the words of one of their critics, William Sherlock, they portray "Christ himself, who was the brightness of his Father's glory, who in the most plain and perspicuous manner declared the will of God to us . . . , with a thicker veil upon his face than Moses."

The former group find the writings of St Augustine ready to hand. And in these works they read the thoughts of a redeemed man who is not afraid to make use of the doctrines of a pagan Plato—did not God use wicked men to build the Ark, and could He not use a pagan Plato, or a Pilate, to accomplish his purposes "in the fulness of time"? According to this pagan Plato, the Sun

is the functional cause of the correlative activity of sensory and sense-object; in such activity, for instance, the object is seen as coloured and its subjective correlate sees colour. And, likewise, in the intelligible realm the Good is the cause of intelligence, an activity in which the intellect perceives and the correlative object becomes intelligible. Again, for Plato desire is not a blind impulsive stirring, but the pursuit of a perceivable object; and, as a consequence, the grade of a man's desire is directly dependent upon the degree of his enlightenment.

St Augustine takes over these Platonic doctrines, and remoulds them. The Sun and the Good he supplants by God the Creator, Sustainer and Redeemer, whose Providence is made evident in the care of things as lowly as the sparrow, and in its crowning manifestation in the Incarnation and Death of His Son—through which unique act the Cross becomes the central fact of history, by which all events before and after become properly significant. Saving knowledge is for St Augustine an illumination in warmth and light unto faith and deed. Through the vouchsafed Grace of God man is enabled in a new way to function in understanding and desire. Even in his awareness, and hatred, of sin as sin there is evidence of the presence of God's Grace: he has been enabled to perceive, and desire, what before he could not see.

Man as creature is a remembering, desiring, perceiving agent. In a state of nature he has these functions; and he continues to have them in a state of grace. When God comes to him he does not lose his memory of past deeds, but is made the more acutely aware of them; he does not lose his reason, or his desire; rather in his new awareness he turns from love of the creature to love of God. God is the cause of his illumination; yet man continues to act through his native human capacities. Of the faculties bestowed upon God's earthly creatures the highest is the distinctively human one, reason; it is through this that the redeemed sinner comes to perceive what before he could not perceive, to desire what before he could not desire; and it is through this, in the function of the rational cognition of commonly intelligible objects, that individual men are enabled to possess (*a*) a Church with a commonly recognized doctrine and discipline, (*b*) an intelligible missionary message, (*c*) an ascertainable rule of life, and (*d*) a rational theology. Thus, in brief, runs the Augustinian

interpretation, which persists to our own time as a definite tradition within the reformed, evangelical Church.

When we turn from Augustinians to those who teach a private, "fanatical" way of faith, we can hardly expect to find such an explicit doctrine: because the latter dismiss the philosophies of men, as well as "the Logic of the Schools," as pagan and barren. Rational principles they shun as carnal works. Even the terms of coherent speech they scorn as things tainted by human imagining. Much of their statement is negative, in condemnation of truths palatable to the natural human understanding. Ethical rules of life they suspect as judgments dictated by the worldly wisdom of worldly men. The Church they regard as an assemblage of individuals with private communications from the Most High, united "in spirit," and emphatically not through a common body of rationally promulgated truths. They acknowledge no *science* of theology, but prefer a song of redemption arrayed sometimes in highly figurative, sometimes in warmly sensuous phrases, sometimes in philosophical terms which appear in the doubtful garb of quotation marks, indicating thus that what is said is not being said!

So much for generalities; let us look for a moment at the specific teachings of one of their representatives. And let us include in our picture of them, if for no other purpose than a comparison with the views of modern Enthusiasts, as many quotations as our space will permit.[2] We shall turn to the published works of John Webster, a writer of some learning and considerable fame, whose strictures on the suitability of reason and learning for the training of Christians and Christian clergy brings a response from no lesser personages than Seth Ward—Savilian Professor of Astronomy at Oxford and afterwards Bishop of Exeter and Salisbury successively, and John Wilkins—Warden of Wadham College, then Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, and later Bishop of Chester.

In *The Epistle Dedicatory* of Webster's *The Judgement Set* we are told that the book is written "that the Lord alone may be magnified who hath carried forth my spirit, to bear witness against all unrighteousness of men, . . . and especially against all those churches, worships, professions, confessions, opinions, covenants, gatherings, traditions of men, observations of times, idol-pastors, hirelings, false teachers, forms, and such like, which are made,

[2] I have modernized spelling and punctuation.

appointed, constituted, ordained, set up, and practised by men, by the carnal wisdom, learning, wit, reason, and policy of the world."

In the Second Epistle to the Reader (probably not written by Webster himself, but by one of his fellow-enthusiasts) we are assured, rather too modestly, "Here thou shalt not find terms of art, nor quirks of human learning and fallen wisdom . . . , but naked truth declaring itself through an earthen vessel in simplicity and plainness of speech, evidencing thereby that our faith ought not, nay doth not stand in the wisdom of men's words, but in the power of God."

The message, the writer of the Second Epistle continues, "declares the emptiness of all our forms, negative religions, duties, precise walkings, preachings, prayings, and all other of our customs and observations."

And further on, in the same Epistle the reader is warned, "It is not thy works, not thy duties, nor thy forms, nor thy notions, nor thy church-gatherings, nor anything else of thine which is the accomplishment of the promises. . . . If these works be wrought by thy industry, by thy care, by thy watchfulness, by thy wisdom, by thy power, they are all odious and abominable. God will as soon accept the offering up of swine's blood, and regard as soon the cutting off a dog's neck as any of these thy duties: for, whatever is done by thee or in thee, except it be done by the wisdom, power, and hand of Jesus Christ, who is the promise-maker, and the promise-worker and accomplisher, they cannot be in him Yea, and in him Amen."

Again, in the prefatory letter to *The Saint's Guide* Webster tells the "dear souls," that "it is not the power of argument, the force of dispute or eloquence, nor the efficacy of human reason, that can more clearly make out the things that are freely given to us of God, than they are by that Spirit that searches all things, yea even the deep things that are of God, in the experience of his Saints, as they all witness, having the same spirit opening unto them that record which God gave of his Son."

The Lord came, he explains, in "the sad experience of mine own dead, sinful, lost and damnable condition in nature, and fully shewed me the nothingness and helplessness of creaturely power, either without or within me, and graciously led me forth to witness, with the Prophet David, that he had drawn me forth of the horrible

pit, and set my feet upon a rock, and established my goings, and then and ever since carried me forth, sometimes in much power, sometimes in weakness."

"Human learning," he continues (p. 2), "or acquired knowledge in its excellency and perfection cannot . . . understand, nor apprehend the mystery of the Gospel; nor any way of its own nature can be advantageous unto it; but is different from it, even hurtful and destructive unto the said end."

"And if," he argues (p. 3),

it be objected, that though human learning be an enemy to the Law of God while it is in a natural and unsanctified heart: yet when the heart is once sanctified, and truly turned to God, then it becomes a sanctified instrument, and a good handmaid to Theology.

To this I answer that though the heart be truly sanctified, in which human learning doth inhere, as in its subject; yet doth it not follow that learning itself is, no more than sin can be said to be sanctified, though the heart of a sinful man may be truly said to be sanctified: for acquired learning by itself, and of its own nature is nothing else but sin, and therefore remains so still, and cannot truly and properly be said to be sanctified, no more than sin.

So that (p. 5) "all those expositions and interpretations of Scripture that have been, are or shall be made by the force and power of human learning, and man's innate notions of wit and reason, are not more than earthly, sensual and devilish, destroying all those that rely upon them or trust in them."

In answer to an opponent he argues again in *The Judgement Set* (p. 291):

But let us hear his learned question, which is this: Is not Reason the specified difference of man from a beast? And was man distinguished from a beast by the Fall, or the Creation? Did the Devil or God make him a rational creature?

I answer: that God made him in his own image, in a more perfect condition than that of reason, and that by following the Devil's advice, he became as a beast, and hath no other guide (in that darkened condition) in himself but the dusky lamps of reason and sense, which is common to the beasts . . . ; for rationality I deny to be the image of God, or the perfection of man.

And he concludes (p. 298):

The greatest knowledge that man by acquisition can attain unto, must needs be the wisdom of the flesh.

But human learning is the greatest knowledge that man by acquisition can attain unto.

Therefore human learning must needs be the wisdom of the flesh; nay, doth not the text tell us plainly that all the imaginations of man's heart are evil, and that continually? And is not all human learning the imaginations of man's heart, and therefore evil continually, . . . and so lusteth against the Spirit, and is therefore sinful and accursed?

II

When we leave the Enthusiasm of the seventeenth century and turn to that of the twentieth, we find ourselves on familiar ground. Once more we meet the doctrine that immediate revelation is not ceased, but is given directly, personally, to each saved man in faith; indeed, so strongly is this insisted upon, one is reminded of the saying of George Keith (*Immediate Revelation*, 2nd ed., 1676, p. 33), "If all Scripture words were out of our present remembrance . . . we could feel and enjoy the Lord, and have fellowship with Him, whose eternal life, virtue and power is present, as a most glorious object in us." Once more we witness the same contempt for the dogmas of men who call themselves Christian and yet substitute "the wisdom of words" for "the power of God." Human thought, reason the perverter, terms of logic, quirks of human learning, Christian ethics, rational theology, the formulation of Heavenly Wisdom in systems of human truth, the belief that through the exercise of his natural faculties the redeemed man can come to understand the nature of God and His Revelation—all such remain subject to the scorn of the Enthusiast's wit, or to the condemnation of his compassionate patience.

It is time, however, that we returned to the book we originally set out to review. In his Preface (p. ix) Professor Bryden announces, by way of summary, three themes: "The disastrous error of Liberalism is its substitution of a mode of conduct to be achieved, for what is simply and always a matter of the unmerited Grace of God. Second, it has assumed that the Christian faith can find its sufficient authentication in history or from historic evidence. Hence its obvious equivocations in regard to the work and power of the Holy Spirit in the soul. Third, it has assumed that a purely objective position can be attained by man as such, by which he may discern and evaluate truth."

Perhaps the reader has already surmised that the argument of our book is to a large degree negative; if so, he will not be in error. The author explains what the Word of God, Faith, Revelation, Christian Knowledge are *not*, very much; what they are, relatively speaking, little. And as we follow his reasoning we find why this is inevitably so; and we are not surprised to meet with such announcements as the following: "Accordingly, with St. Paul, every Christian is obliged to say that it has been by the peculiar

activity of God's grace that he knows salvation, as it is also by this same grace that he knows his responsibility and guilt before God. Further explanation does not seem to be granted to man. A theology which refuses to become speculative recognizes this fact" (p. 162). Again, "True preaching can do nothing but 'point up' to Him" (p. 225). Towards the end of his work (p. 226) our author announces, "In what remains . . . I shall endeavour to indicate for our present day and circumstances what I believe Christians should be thinking and saying, first, in regard to God . . . , second, in regard to the Righteousness of God . . . , and lastly in regard to the Church." But after some four lines he is, once again, attacking the "Moderns." And, all in all, some four or five pages, in which the "uniqueness" of the Christian's God, Righteousness and Church are stressed, out of the remaining thirty-eight, are devoted to consecutive statement of affirmative doctrine!

Not that the author is shy of positive statement, however; indeed at times he can be quite dogmatic, as is often the case with men who are called upon to speak what they believe. He asserts, for example, "If for the moment it be conceded that there is something *creatively new* in the event by which a man becomes a Christian, surely it follows that there cannot be a preparation in man for this *new* factor" (p. 153); and again, "When the Christian is asked Who God is, his answer cannot be in terms other than those the Church had been obliged to make in her various Confessions in the (early) period we have considered" (p. 212). He deals abruptly with the "words which Etienne Gilson . . . believes to represent an Old Testament 'metaphysic of Being' . . . *ego sum qui sum*." "There is, of course," he asserts (p. 70), "no such thing as a metaphysic of any kind in the Old Testament. 'I am that I am' refers to the Holy God, 'Who inhabiteth Eternity,' and for that reason cannot give His Name (what He essentially is) to mere creature-man; being eternal He cannot objectify Himself in temporalities—and yet He can make Himself known." Many will be unable to detect here a refutation of Professor Gilson's claim, no matter what they may think of its validity; and some may wonder why the writer stresses his criticism, especially when his own argument begins and ends with an "Absolute," of "transcendent nature," "known to Christian faith." Only, perhaps, after attentive reading will the reason become evident: it is because Professor Bryden chooses to accept what he calls a "personal-

Absolute," and to reject what others interpret as a "metaphysical absolute." (See pp. 94, 110, 133.)

Such matters aside, the first theme announced in our statement from the Preface is the opposition between "a mode of conduct to be achieved" and "a matter of unmerited Grace of God." Here, of course, the author is not thinking merely of the impotence of the saint as a moral agent in furthering the Kingdom of God, but of "the tendency, so widespread, so widespread nowadays both in Protestant and in Catholic thinking, . . . to find what is normative in Christianity, not so much in its *origin* as in its developed and more or less perfected forms or *achievements*" (p. 50). Professor Bryden maintains that the creation and salvation of Christianity are *uniquely* of God. And here, I think, most writers on the subject will be prepared to agree with him. But they will not be prepared to follow him in the same numbers when he goes on to say (p. 54) that the "test" of "the unique value" of Christianity "is in its origin alone." Nor will many accept all of the following corollaries which he draws from these theses. (*a*) "A purely logical account can never be given of God's revealing of Himself to man, because it is a knowledge . . . received by man in faith by grace" (p. 195). (The word "purely" is, if I understand the author aright, quite redundant). (*b*) "Man within the faith is . . . under the constraint of God's Word. . . . He, therefore, rightly refuses to consider a rational synthesis of the opposing truths involved in it" (p. 156). (*c*) "Revelation permits no anthropomorphizations, not even of the higher kind" (p. 235). Hence the theologian, when attempting to assert positive doctrine, is driven in the end merely to "affirm" or to "point to" God's unique "works"! Let us hear Professor Bryden on this point. Christian faith, he says (p. 235), "speaks in a definite, positive way of God's character, as for instance: God is . . . Creator, . . . Lord, . . . of sovereign Will. . . . But observe, He is none of these—and this is the all important matter—simply in accord with some category of human thinking." "When a Christian says that God is 'Almighty,' or that He is altogether 'Sovereign,' . . . rather is he pointing to the fact that God's power and will are unique." "If a Christian says that God is 'Creator,' he . . . is simply affirming again the uniqueness of God's works, that these are of a nature which man has no means of understanding" (p. 236). (*d*) Revelation, "this creative thing, this 'increase of God' . . . which is unique, . . . is

not ever *chosen* by man; and for this he has never antecedent preparation" (p. 154).

We shall have occasion to return later to certain of these four points; in the meantime, let us notice more closely a problem mentioned in (*d*), namely "preparation." This is one of great consequence for our author: he believes that the "unique" event of revelation has no real continuity with the events in time which are the exercise of man's natural faculties, his knowledge, his moral history, or the seekings and achievements of the race to which he belongs. Professor Bryden contends (p. 224) that "however awesome the moral and religious achievements of the historic religions, however significant of the 'incurably religious nature of man,' these do not provide a *preparatio evangelica*." The knowledge given in salvation, is not, he affirms (p. 16), "merely a fuller knowledge, *in continuum* with that possessed already by men, but . . . something so radically new that it served to negate in a sense all the preceding religious beliefs and traditions among men." And he will not even countenance the view that " 'Christianity has adopted forms from outside sources and put into them a meaning of its own, and if the origin of sacrifice in primitive religious ideas has not rendered it unfit to express the doctrine of atonement, there is no *a priori* reason why it should be inadmissible in the sphere of worship' " (p. 53). To admit the validity of this claim would be, he believes, to grant "that Christian truth is essentially a continuance of the religious traditions, beliefs and customs of men which preceded it" (p. 54). Indeed what many interpret as God's providential care in the history of His natural creatures has no place, if I understand our author aright, in Christian theological teaching concerning revelation and salvation. While he is prepared to acknowledge (p. 174) that "in times past, Scripture tells us that God . . . employed even a Pilate in the determination of His Holy Will in regard to Jesus Christ," he condemns as very wrong the statement of D. W. Boussett that the Gospel is "the focal point of a great spiritual happening. . . . Iranian apocalypse and speculation, . . . Platonic eschatology, the Platonic hymn of the eternal home of the soul, the ethic of the Stoic, . . . the strivings of religions towards a universalism. . . . All . . . represents a great fabricating, . . . a great eventuality under the ordinance of God. . . . 'When the time was fulfilled God sent His Son' " (p. 46).

But not yet has Professor Bryden's opposition to history been

made adequately manifest. He goes on to explain further that if theology is not to be based on the natural history of the natural man, or on the empirical history of races and nations, no more is it to be gathered from the personal record of its Founder: "To know the historic Jesus, to appreciate the qualities of His personality—if such were possible—is not necessarily to know anything about the revelation of God in Jesus Christ" (p. 86). "There is, in any case, nothing in the personality of Jesus alone . . . to make manifest God's essential revelation in Him, and there is nothing in the New Testament, moreover, to encourage us to consider His personality as important in itself" (p. 85). The purpose of the Synoptic Gospels is not (pp. 6-7) to state the record of Jesus' words and deeds, but to provide an apologetic for a christological claim already made by his followers concerning their Saviour.

The record of history must never be confused with the Word of God. Indeed the Word of God "is prior to and transcends both the Scripture and the Church . . . and Creation as well. Briefly, the Word of God is the Source, the *raison d'etre*, of all three" (p. 14). And since It has this transcendency (p. 25),

> no scrupulous nor painstaking industry in the letter of scriptural records will ever disclose to man what is that Word of God by which this very Scripture itself came into existence. . . . Scripture . . . , criticism can show, . . . is perhaps replete with numerous discrepancies, is characterized in places with what are said to be dubious moralities, and . . . its earlier records everywhere seem to present much that does not stand the test of historic or scientific inquiry. One thing is certain, and needs to be said emphatically: no human learning, human insight, nor human powers of explanation or exposition can ever, so to speak, *expose* the Word of God (hidden in Scripture) to the human heart.

Consequently, the real theologian is not (p. 26) the scholar turned scribe, but a prophet (p. 30) "under the constraint of . . . God's Word." Such a teacher is assured in his experience that Revelation is not confined to any time in history. He knows the Truth only because "the Holy Spirit reveals . . . , *acting* personally and immediately upon his soul" (p. 214).

Revelation occurs "always in the concrete human situation and upon the rational, moral and historical plane" (p. 197). But it is not, we now know, "substantiated" from mere history: nor yet, we are to be informed, from humanly ethical considerations. The New Testament, the record of its manifestation, is, according to Professor Bryden (p. 97), "not the place to go if we are desirous of knowing what precisely we must do, or

refrain from doing, in this particular concrete situation or that." "Nothing in the conversation which Jesus is reported to have had with men . . . is of a nature to cause us to think that He, as a teacher, was essentially absorbed in ethical interests or social conditions and relations, or that the message He brought was primarily or fundamentally one concerned with such things at all" (p. 81). No emphasis is placed by Him (p. 80) "upon all that which challenges men to 'achieve' things Christian, to 'advance the cause' of Christianity, i.e. 'to help bring the Kingdom of God on earth.'" The New Testament "is a book which makes us all Pharisees and hypocrites, because it refuses to honour religious credits or endorse moral achievements" (p. 98). In fine, "the kingdom of God is represented in the New Testament . . . always as a sheer gift of God. . . . That is to say, the kingdom of God was at no time something which was in the hands of men, either for its creating, its advancing, or indeed for its remaking" (p. 94).

And if this Revelation which manifests itself in "the rational, moral and historical" refuses the substantiation of history and morals, what is to be its attitude to the third member of the trilogy, the rational? The outlook for reason appears none too promising; for we are promptly warned (p. 24) that "the grand fallacy" of the historico-critical school is the presumption "to find this revelation in history and in the factual alone . . . so employed as to resolve the revelation of the New Testament into a matter of merely ethical and rational 'ideas' which authenticate themselves as truth because they are universal and are thus independent of the conditions and contingencies of history." Christian Faith, the correlate of Revelation, we are told (p. 164), "has its own way of thinking"; but the caution is added (p. 31), this thinking must not be used to compare "Christian *rationales* of life . . . with other *rationales* of life," or to bring the Word of God into conformity with the "commanding thought-conceptions" of a particular age. We are not unprepared, then, for the further statement (p. 160): "Revelation as such has nothing to do essentially with logical, human, rational systems. Revelation brings its own category of interpretation, . . . not to be co-related rationally with the forms and categories of man's natural reason in order to be understood. Such a procedure would make human reason the Judge of God and His revelation."

Not that our author is unwilling to notice the natural functions

of man: " 'The rational,' " he admits (p. 196), "represents the highest faculty in man's possession, indeed is the prerogative of man, and it finally distinguishes man from the other orders of God's creations on earth." But, he goes on to explain, natural reason is nothing more than "an instrument adapted to the understanding of this world, of its governing laws, its conditions and its content, [it] is not adequate as an instrument to measure the eternal order." "To rationalize" about the Eternal is, he contends (p. 114), "to humanize and to naturalize"; this "constitutes" none other than "that presumptuous sin by which man brings God within the orbit of his own understanding and thus makes God no-god" (p. 122). Theology, accordingly, must never become a philosophy (p. 30). God did not come to man "to communicate 'ideas,' to illumine the mind, and thus provide ideals for men to emulate" (p. 123). Christian Truth is not to be explained in terms of "truths" (p. 103). Revelation is not the gift of thoughts but the presence of the Absolute in a *unique* experience.

The nature of Christian reality is Absolute and not relative. Its Absolute character is witnessed by, (*a*) its unique origin—as we have seen; (*b*) its rationally unresolvable paradoxes: God and man in one (p. 109), God's bringing existence out of non-existence (p. 154), the counsel of St Paul: " 'Work out your own salvation in fear and trembling, for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure' " (p. 155); and (*c*) its uniquely personal character: "Revelation," our author reiterates (p. 106), "is always personal, personal in a sense that no other relationship in life is ever personal—personal, because being an encounter between God and the soul alone, it is utterly exclusive and unique. It completely isolates man from his fellows." So personal is the experience of faith in revelation that he to whom it is vouchsafed finds it "impossible . . . to express in purely rational thought and terminology" (p. 121); so isolated is it, he "*cannot reveal to another what God in Christ is.*" "And, perhaps," concludes our author, "what we have endeavoured to say is more calculated to confuse than clarify." It will be better perhaps, therefore, to say "nothing," (p. 225) and merely "point up" to Him.

Thus does Professor Bryden land with consistency and candour in the predicament of the irrationalistic enthusiast. He does not, moreover, seem to regret his predicament; his plight, he believes, might be infinitely worse: he might, for example, be in the position

of those who believe that finite man, with his relativities and "anthropomorphizations," can fathom the Eternal! In any case, he portrays the theologian as a prophet without an apologetic, a dogmatic, a Christian ethic, or a missionary message amenable to statement in the terms of rational truths and to apprehension through the natural powers of man. That unique experience to which the theologian would witness proves too personal for intelligible communication, too transcendent to be brought within the confines of an epistemological object shared by cognitively perceptive agents.

There are critics, obviously, who will be ready to argue that the cause of our author's predicament lies in something more than the finitude and relativity of things human, namely his scorn of ideas. Professor Bryden, they will observe, is anxious lest professing Christians substitute ideas of God for God's immediate Revelation, the definitions of faith for faith itself (p. 204). But, they will counsel, there is no more necessity for a Christian's confusing the idea of God with the Divine Object than for his mistaking an idea of bread for bodily nutriment. Again, these epistemologists will complain, our author commits an arbitrary act when he separates ideas from what he calls personal, concrete experience. And they will go on to remind him that ideas, *logoi*, even for post-Aristotelian Greeks, have a threefold reference, as function in rational agents, as representations of objects perceived, and as propositional truths concerning these objects; and that if these three are kept separate Professor Bryden need have no fear.

All this, however, will—as a sort of Augustinianism—be, for our author, beside the point. Christian knowledge, he has already told us, is not a species of natural knowing through the natural powers of natural man. An epistemology or psychology which deals with such is, therefore, irrelevant to it. "Theology does not derive from the results of human discovery, whatever the character of the discoveries which men make may be" (p. 30). Man's knowledge, like God's creation, is sundered in explanation as well as act, the natural order from the Eternal. Revelation is the source of a unique knowledge which witnesses by its very happening "that those orders, radically different, have miraculously become one through the action of God alone" (p. 112). Christian knowledge is not the act of finite man at all, but the "creative" visitation of the Most High. "Revelation, in this unique sense, with the power

manifested which corresponds to it," explains our author (p. 126), "represents an action of God which has no truly human analogy. It is best described as that which 'searches' man, 'judges' him altogether, 'knows' him in the inward parts, makes him known to himself, not in a merely relative way as other knowledge does, but in an absolute way. And it does all this to the end that it may make him free from himself, i.e. save him. Such revelation, therefore, does not merely engender ideas: it *deals* with man."

COMMERCIALISM AND THE JEWS

BERNARD LANDE COHEN

THE Jews have been called "The People of the Book," and by others they have been called "The Pilgrims of Commerce." No less so than the scholar, the Jewish merchant of our time is the heir of a memorable tradition, since the birth of his calling reaches back to the days of King Solomon. Such indeed was the geographical position of ancient Palestine, that it invited its inhabitants to the pursuit of trade, so that the commercial apprenticeship of the Hebrew can be said to have coincided with the writing of the Bible.

It was Kipling who referred to Palestine as "the buckle in the belt of the world." But in the far more circumscribed world of antiquity so large an appraisement could have been made with even greater assurance. At a time when neither Europe nor China was yet of any consequence in the community of old-world nations, the area lying between the Nile and the Euphrates was the most central region of the world. Between Egypt and Mesopotamia, respectively the Occident and Orient of the early world, Palestine was the natural and obvious corridor, for merchant caravans no less than for armies on the march. Nor were Palestine's natural resources of trifling importance in the days of Israel's kings and prophets. The land that was said metaphorically to be flowing with milk and honey was, during long ages, celebrated among the Gentiles as the main emporium for wine and olives, two of the major necessities of early civilization.

Biblical Palestine's economic importance is further to be gauged from the fact that it happened to be the next-door neighbour of Phoenicia, the land chosen as the cradle of ancient commerce. In the twenty-seventh chapter of the *Book of Ezekiel* we find an *exposé* of the far-flung trade connections of this nation, with mention being made of Ethiopia, Libya, Greece, Italy and Spain, Lydia and Armenia. In all these regions the Phoenicians had planted their trading posts. There is ample reason to suppose that even before the time of King Solomon, their booths and warehouses were quite familiar to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, Shechem, and Bethel. For a long time, indeed, the term "Canaanite" (Phoenician)

was synonymous with "merchant" in the speech of the Hebrews.[1] It was none other than the Phoenicians who brought with them from the groves of southern Arabia the fragrant myrrh, ordained for the sacrificial altar at Jerusalem, and from far-off Cornwall the tin needed to make the bronze vessels of the Temple. From their own workshops of Tyre and Sidon they imported the linen cloth for the priestly vestments. It is not an improbable conjecture that the Scriptural command as to the rights of the stranger within the gates was intended specifically for the protection of these alien merchants whose activity was so beneficial to the land of Israel.

The reign of the House of David was justly celebrated as the most illustrious era of the ancient Hebrews. This line of kings, which included an unusual proportion of worthy rulers, presided over a period of rising prosperity. Soon there were men in Jerusalem who were skilled in the blowing of glass, and in fashioning objects in gold and silver, bronze, lead, and stone. Emulating their Phoenician neighbours, the Children of Israel turned away for all time from their purely agrarian and pastoral economy to join in the more adventurous pursuits of commerce.

But as with other nations, industry and trade among the Hebrews brought social evils in their wake. It was inevitable under pre-capitalistic conditions that cities should grow and prosper only at the expense of the rural population. Labour-saving devices being virtually unknown, the value of manufactured goods was inordinately high in terms of agricultural produce. This implied a growing burden on the peasantry in terms of rent and taxation. All too often debt and foreclosure would complete the cycle, so that the concentration of large estates in the hands of a few, or what the prophet Isaiah termed "laying field to field," was the inevitable concomitant of commercial opulence.

Only among the Jews was the attempt made to stem this universal drift towards feudalism, it being decreed that the land was to be divided equally to begin with, and that no individual holding was to be permanently alienated. In avoidance of the bad example of Egypt, the sacerdotal orders were prevented from engrossing the land. "The priests and the Levites and all the tribe of Levi shall have no part or inheritance with Israel."[2]

[1] *Hosea* 12: 7. [2] *Deuteronomy* 18: 1.

The institution of slavery, while not prohibited by the Hebrews, was hedged with so many restrictions as to make of it a relatively unimportant factor in their economy. It was due to a superabundance of slave labour and its merciless utilization that the architecture of the classical world was able to attain a development so precocious as to rival and even excel that of our own time. But in old Jerusalem there were no stately pleasure domes and no triumphal gates to rival those of Egyptian Thebes and Babylon. Nor was the Temple of Solomon of such lofty dimensions as to give it place among the Seven Wonders. If in the cities of Judaea there were to be found none of the adornments of Antioch and Edessa, Pergamum and Samosata, it was because of a sound religious and ethical interdiction of towering edifices and a multiplicity of temples. Human life was held in greater value than marble structures. It was this relative absence of a servile population among the Jews which permitted their working classes to be held in greater esteem, and to be considered worthy of protective measures. Above all is it to be noted that the Hebrew code, alone among all the codes of antiquity, recognized no order of nobility and legalized no privileged class.

Like most of the world's great books, the Bible is the product of a commercial people; but not of a people that were ruthlessly commercial as were the Carthaginians. The Hebrews of old were by no means the inventors of ethics, since there is every ground for the opinion that the Egyptians preceded them in the enunciation of ethical maxims. But it was to the merit of the Hebrews that they strove conscientiously to give to their ethical maxims the force of law, thus linking together morality and law. While undoubtedly among them there was a sufficient divergence between the prescripts of their laws and their actual enforcement, it would seem true none the less that their laws did provide some barrier against injustice, and some protection of the weak against the strong. Judged by the standard of the times, Jerusalem was indeed a quiet habitation, with none of the sanguinary affrays between rich and poor that stained the cities of the Graeco-Roman world.

Through an understanding of the commercial background of the Bible its lessons take on an added significance and grandeur. We then realize, for example, how an apparently obscure historical event such as the destruction of the first Jewish commonwealth by the Assyrians and Babylonians had serious repercussions on an

unripe world. To the Egyptians these calamities of the Hebrews were of great inconvenience, since it was on Palestine that they depended largely for wine and oil. Hence it was that the laying waste of Israel's fields and vineyards compelled the conservative Egyptians to seek new trade relationships. They were persuaded to open their coasts to the importunate Greeks; and, as everyone knows, this contact between the Egyptians and the Greeks was a decisive event in the broadening out of Grecian civilization.

The theory that the Jewish people turned to trade on account of being persecuted in their places of exile, and that they were compelled *en masse* to embrace a calling uncongenial to them, should be discountenanced as a naïve and uncalled-for apology. Jewish commercialism is much older than the age of persecution, and much older than the dispersion. Contrariwise, Jewish commercialism can be shown to have been the principal reason for their dispersion. And as a corollary of this assertion I would maintain that the dispersion of the Jews and their wanderings across the face of the earth have been the essential cause of their survival.

Apart from a number of forced deportations by Assyrians, Babylonians, and Romans, the withdrawal of the Jews from Palestine was an orderly and gradual process, and was induced by economic circumstances. Long before the loss of their national independence, Jews were comfortably ensconced in the principal cities of Egypt, Asia Minor, Greece, Italy, and even Spain and Gaul. Their departure from the land of their fathers was impelled by considerations of commerce, and corresponded to the migrations of contemporary Phoenicians and Greeks, and indeed to that of the English in modern times. Their early dispersion was assisted by an incipient network of communications, embracing new roads and improvements in navigation, in much the same manner as the further dispersal of their descendants in latter times was assisted by the railway and the steamship.

The exodus of the Jews from Palestine was a gradual, and for the most part unhurried process, requiring at least a thousand years. It is difficult to determine even the century when Palestine ceased to be predominantly a Jewish country. Certainly it continued to be the centre of Jewry long after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. Paradoxically, it was not the victory of Rome over Jerusalem, but the later decay of Rome which caused the

land of Israel to be wholly deserted by its children. The Roman Empire, though anticipating in some respects the civilization of modern times, could not long endure on account of its lack of considerable foreign trade and its isolated existence among so many barbaric nations. Imagine a population scarcely larger than that of modern France having to protect itself not only along the Rhine, but also along the entire length of the Danube, the Euphrates, and the Sahara desert! The cost of this chain of defence, added to that of the occasional civil war, was bound in the end to prove too much. At first, Roman militarism devoured none but the poor, but ere long the rich too saw the menacing shadows as the rustic population could no longer shoulder the burden. As under modern Fasco-Communism, it became the usual procedure to raise revenue through requisitions and confiscations; and so excessive were the demands of the military heirarchy that taxation became indistinguishable from outright pillage. Throughout the Mediterranean world trade came to a standstill, with famine and disease everywhere triumphant. Palestine was not exempted from the fate which engulfed the whole Roman Empire. Entire communities were said to have fled in order to escape the imperial tax collectors. We are told that in the second century it was quite an ordinary thing for Jews, in desperation, to take to the hills to become robbers.[3] But by far the greater number left the country and betook themselves to the more promising areas of the Asiatic interior.

Palestine ceased to be Jewish when it could no longer harbour a commercially-minded community. It was fortunate, if not providential, that the previous establishment of numerous Jewish outposts made it possible for Palestinians to go elsewhere once they had perceived the omens of decline. It was fortunate for their survival that the Jews of old were not in the condition of an immobile peasantry, forever rooted to its native soil, and waiting to be submerged and assimilated by the endless torrent of Persians, Arabs, Turks, Crusaders, and Mongols, by which the land was impregnated during the centuries that followed.

It was not so much persecution as an adventurous commercialism which ordained that the Jews were to become a wandering nation and scattered to the ends of the earth. It can be assumed that even without the persecution of the Russian Czars to drive

[3]Graetz, *History of the Jews*, II, p. 465.

them from eastern Europe, the cities of the North American seaboard would still have received the Jews in very large numbers. Commerce, more than any other single factor, accounts for the manner in which the Jews have been distributed throughout the world; and the fluctuations of commerce explain the shifting of Jewish population from one period to another. Until the discovery of America and for some time after, the centre of gravity of world Jewry lay not in Europe but in western Asia. In the Middle Ages, no Jewish community in Europe, with the single exception of Barcelona, numbered more than a thousand souls, while during this period in Persia there were cities containing from fifty to even eighty thousand Jews. This comparison is not surprising when it is recalled that the city of Tabriz, with its million inhabitants, was alone estimated to contain within its walls more riches than the entire kingdom of France.

Thanks to a preservative instinct conferred upon him by his commercial propensities, the Jew has at all times gravitated towards the more favoured areas of the globe. A glance at any of the maps of the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, in which are indicated the principal dwelling places of the mediaeval Jews of England, France, Italy, Germany, and Spain, shows quite clearly that they tended always to settle along the main highways of trade and transportation. In thus establishing their communities in the more favoured parts of Europe, they were certainly acting under no compulsion. The compulsory feature of their wanderings displayed itself only in the later Middle Ages when persecution drove them from the richer countries of western Europe and forced them to assemble in too large numbers in eastern Germany, Poland, Bohemia, and Rumania.

The participation of the Church in the persecution of the Jews has been exaggerated. It seems unjust to dwell only on acts of religious fanaticism without also taking into account the manifold instances where pontiffs and bishops displayed Christian charity by intervening on behalf of Jews. When everything is included in a long retrospect, neither Christianity nor Islam has been anti-Jewish; and it should be noted that with few exceptions Jews have at all times chosen to live in Christian or Moslem countries. It is nevertheless true that on account of their fewness and political defencelessness Jews have been the principal targets of economic nationalism, a virus that originated in the Middle Ages, and has

often assumed the most inhuman forms. While merchants of every nationality have at one time or another been made to suffer expulsion and discrimination, as for example the Italians who were expelled from England shortly after the Jews in 1291, the Jews, being at no time in a position to retaliate, have always been the easiest victims of commercial jealousy.

It is inevitable that a "nation of shop-keepers" will have its faults, and a sufficient number of enemies to exaggerate these faults. But properly regarded, the Jew's commercialism, far from being a dry stick, may be compared to the rod of Aaron. Joined as it has always been to an inner celestial fire, it has made possible the preservation of a nation through many vicissitudes, for neither the materialistic nor the spiritual element in the Jew would of itself have made this possible. It is, above all, in the light of his dual character that the Jew's historic relationship to Palestine is to be understood. For centuries this land was fated to remain one of the neglected corners of the eastern hemisphere, more especially so after the world's centre of gravity had been shifted in the sixteenth century by the discovery of the ocean route from Europe to the East. For centuries on end, Palestine offered no prospect whatever for the livelihood of a commercial population; and so it remained a Holy Land in the enjoyment of a perpetual Sabbath. But since the opening of the Suez Canal in 1870, and more especially since the institution of long-distance aerial transport, Palestine tends once again to become the ligament, not of two, but of three continents, and so gives new substance to the spiritual yearnings of a people.

THE WAR AND OPINION

I. THE NEXT BRITISH EMPIRE

DONALD COWIE

THE first World War had profound effects upon the British Empire. It is not too much to say that the Empire entered that war as a patriarchal family, and emerged from it—well, as a modern family. Undoubtedly the present cataclysm will accelerate evolutionary processes to still swifter speed. We can read the portents already. And we should be wise to examine them at once, while a certain power to influence the course of events remains in our hands.

The last war's results provide a rough signpost to investigation. At the outbreak Britain made strong demands on the new Dominions—they had been colonies only a few years before—and these were met with such alacrity that no one was more surprised than Britain herself. This was not only a heaping of coals of fire for past neglect; it was also an astounding revelation of potential strength. Accordingly, the Dominions were invited to take an even larger share in the conduct of the war; by the end they were equal in status, if not with the principal Allies, at least with the rest.

Previously they had been given, with Dominion status, nominal independence; now this was a real thing, and the twin signs were their independent representation at the Peace Conference and in the new League of Nations, and the post-war discussion of constitutional forms that promoted the Statute of Westminster. Before that war the foreign chancelleries had been contemptuous of the Dominions, if not completely unaware of their separate existence. Afterwards it was forced upon the attention of Berlin, Washington, Tokyo, Paris, Rome, that several new and distinct Britains had sprung up overnight. These sudden countries might still be more interested in trade than power politics—showing in this that they were genuine chips off the old block—but they could raise remarkably loud voices at Geneva, and were already sending abroad their own diplomatists.

The trade interest was, however, itself a portent. Before that first World War the Dominions had laboured chiefly in what might be described as an economic annex to Britain. Their main produce was primary, mineral and agricultural, their first source of

income the export of such produce to Britain. During that war they had been encouraged to develop manufacturing industries, also to increase primary production by intensive cultivation and the opening of new lands. Afterwards they realized that further development of factories would make them less dependent upon Britain and provide their workers with employment alternative to that of the fickle land; they found that their farms were now over-producing, and so they must discover markets alternative to those of Britain, or die. Thus the new political independence coincided with a tacit campaign for economic emancipation. A fatal obstacle, however, to such emancipation—especially in the case of Australia and New Zealand—was financial indebtedness to Britain, that necessitated constant trade with that country to maintain interest payments. The first World War had increased rather than diminished this obstacle.

But the matter was comparatively insignificant beside the greater freedoms. There was, in addition, the new consciousness of nationhood in each Dominion, which had been extracted, however painfully, from the fire of war. The soldiers did so well, making for every Dominion a distinct military reputation, and so many men had gone abroad, and then returned with new eyes of appreciation for their hitherto unregarded homes, that the war created the Dominions as national entities, as sovereign—or self-conscious—states. The imperial egg-shell had been incubated and the chicks were out.

Perhaps the sudden speed of the process had been its outstanding mark, the product of scientific methods in war, which had killed more men, destroyed more property, and involved more countries in a shorter time than any previous conflict in history. And what has been the chief difference between the second Great War and the first, so far as we have been able to judge during the initial twelve months? It has been a still greater quickening of the tempo. Several campaigns have already been fought and lost or won. Several revolutions in tactics and strategy have already occurred. Practically all the experience of the four years, 1914-18, has been telescoped into one. The machines of death move at four hundred miles an hour as against a hundred then. The Empire. . . .

It is already possible, thanks to this still greater speed of events, to discover trends.

Let us recapitulate. On the outbreak of war the Dominions again offered all they had. Britain at once let it be known that she would prefer to take, at first, raw products and goods rather than services. The Dominions agreed. Within a few weeks it was announced that great commercial arrangements had been made. Britain would buy all the principal export products of the Dominions, for the whole duration of the war, at fixed prices.

Similar arrangements had been made in the first World War, but not till the end. Now it was all done in a few weeks. The finance involved was staggering. Britain had agreed to take everything and was going to pay for it at good prices, and would begin paying at once. Obviously she had realized that her ability to maintain her supplies in face of air and submarine attack would decide her fate. It was best to arrange at once for all she could get; and more, to encourage the Dominions immediately to develop war industries, such as munitions works and aircraft factories, in case the air attack succeeded in paralysing production at home. So the wholesale order was given, probably with the departmental addendum to "spare no expense." But did the British government, and the Dominion governments who gladly received the orders, realize exactly where this mighty movement might end?

A few people did, and among them Mr Keynes, who took an early opportunity of pointing out that, as a result of the wholesale purchases, Britain would be, in effect, *borrowing* from the Dominions on her trading account. This, he explained, would proceed from the use made of "the increased balances held in London by the Dominion and other banks as a result of the large contracts which have been placed for the purchase of raw materials within the Empire. Let us put this contribution at £100 million." But it does not pay to examine economic details too closely, lest trees obscure the wood. Mr Keynes's reflection was upon a minor aspect. The trend was soon revealed as broader than that.

It was, briefly, that to pay for so much concentrated economic assistance from the Dominions in such a short time at such fair prices Britain would have, in her turn at last, to get into the Dominions' debt. How else could she pay? It would be quite impossible, despite all the export drives in the world, for her to pay, orthodoxly, in her own manufactured goods. As an actual fact, some of the Dominions were taking special care already to

see that their own manufacturers were not thus flooded out.* But Britain, in any case, needed most of her factories for war production. No, there was the one way only, and that meant, for the first time in the history of this British Empire, an open abdication of some financial sovereignty on the part of the Mother Country, which had hitherto held the reins of imperial finance. To fight the war on behalf of all, Britain would have, at least partly, to relinquish her economic hold on the Dominions.

The inevitability of this was increased by the American business. Thanks partly to the shortsightedness of her rulers in the post-war years, Britain could no longer obtain war materials from the United States on credit. She must hand over dollars for every purchase. One Dominion, Canada, was in a happy position to help, and started to help at once, magnificently. But Canada would have to be paid in pounds for what she bought in dollars —also for the mounting quantity of munitions and aircraft she would soon supply from her own factories, also for services rendered in connection with the Empire Air Training Scheme, a vast enterprise of what might be decisive long-term value. It was not surprising that the first move in the process of shifting the imperial economic emphasis should be made as between Britain and Canada. A large part of the Dominion of Canada three and a half per cent registered stock, 1930-50, held in London, was sold back to the Canadian government by means of a refunding operation. Thus the British government was already, in effect, cancelling Dominion debts in order to pay the Dominions for help in the war.

This process was bound to be. Indeed, it will have to be extended. It is the logical way out. If the present economic mobilization of the Empire is to continue as planned, eventually it will involve tremendous sums of money, the cost of the produce, minerals, manufactured goods, munitions, aircraft, dollar exchange, which Britain will receive from the Dominions. The simplest method of paying will be to sell back stock to the Dominions. There is no need here—although it would make an interesting separate investigation—to probe the details of this matter further. We are concerned with the next British Empire.

It has been noticed already that the chief remaining shackle on the Dominions after the first World War was just this burden

*Written before the recent Canadian budget with its increased preferential treatment of imports from Great Britain (EDITORS' NOTE).

of oversea debt. The burden had modified the economies of the Dominions since the beginning. The "London balance" or the "London funds" had ever been the prime consideration of Dominion governments. Some, notably Canada, had begun to liberate themselves from the incubus, but none was free. But now there is the chance of freedom. If, by the end of the war, Britain has remitted a substantial part of the Dominions' indebtedness, the whole economic emphasis in the Empire will have been changed. A creditor nation is a magnet to which trade and commerce automatically flies. Britain has occupied that position in the Empire. She may do so no longer, or at least not to the same extent. Then the next British Empire will be, economically, a far more balanced thing.

As subsidiary to this, the forced-draught development of manufacturing in the Dominions will make them still more self-contained. It used to be one country at the centre which did all the factory work, while the others sent food for the artisans' feeding and received some of their products in exchange. It would seem that eventually each country may both feed and clothe itself, and none may be pre-eminent, save when possessing some product that the others do not have. Thus South Africa and Canada might easily become wealthier and stronger than the others because they possess certain indispensable minerals that the others lack.

The only factor that militates against the perfect fulfilment of this prediction is population. In the past, wealth has never availed a country unless it possessed overwhelming man-power too. Without man-power, wealth has always been a danger, for it has attracted the many but impoverished to attempt some desperate deed—and rarely without success.

Such danger must be foreseen and circumvented. Here we come at last to the political. It is obvious that the redistribution of wealth in the Empire by the war will have to be accompanied by an equal spreading of political power and social opportunity. The ideal method would be for the Dominions to throw open their doors wide to immigrants from Britain. People would be free to live and work anywhere they liked in the British Empire. Then the population would follow the wealth—as it always does, if allowed—and there would be no unnatural counter-pulling or strain. England might become a little land again, but few English-

men would really mind that if they found a level of living twice as high in Canada, Australia, South Africa, or New Zealand.

There was a great outflow of migrants from Britain to the Dominions after the last war, and how the Dominions prospered during that time! They only slumped when, interfering arbitrarily with the natural movement, they restricted immigration all at once. The same applies to the United States.

It has been shown—and anyone can see—that the economic effect of this war will be to impoverish Britain, and to stimulate the Dominions. The political effect, partly issuing from that, will be to increase the power of the Dominions and yet to endanger these countries if they have not, in the meantime, planned for larger populations. But there is a still wider political possibility.

The present is, beyond all its predecessors, a war to end war. Most intelligent men, and not a few politicians, are agreed that the world cannot be safe unless so re-grouped that the conditions of war are no longer present. It is agreed now that if all the democracies, for an instance, had banded together ten years ago, built a joint army, and announced that any aggressor would be instantly suppressed, there would have been no second World War, or, for that matter, Chinese invasion, rape of Abyssinia, Austria, Spain, Czechoslovakia, Albania—and all the rest. And the very method that has been adopted to win this war now is just such a banding together. When Mr Churchill begins to talk of an Anglo-French union, and of Anglo-American co-operation rolling along like the Mississippi, he is perhaps a major prophet once again.

War trends of the Colonial Empire and India seem to run along the same line. The colonies of Africa, to defend themselves, are this moment achieving the unity, and a unity with the jealous big brother, South Africa, that African administrators have always so vainly endeavoured to bring about. The West Indies have been swept into a single grouping at one swift blow. The outposts in the South Seas have imperceptibly crept under the Australasian wing. India—the problem there is too large for this discussion—but India, Burma, Malaya could, if they wanted, form an impregnable union of interest, and they would have American as well as British support.

It is a grandiose prospect, and not, admittedly, an Empire at all. Like all grandiose prospects, moreover, it is so far vaguely

outlined. There is a shadowy conception of a British Empire consisting of a few equally important states or groups, allied for trading and protective purposes with each other and with other states, or groups, of a similar philosophy and mind. The constitution of the old British Empire, as embodied in the Statute of Westminster, might well be taken as the constitution of this, but it would not be a national thing. The ideas of Mr Lionel Curtis and Mr Clarence Streit would meet here, no less than those of the New Commonwealth Society, which, with Mr Churchill on its list of officers once, advocated the creation of an international air force. . . .

But this is to speculate very much at random. The facts, so far, seem to be that the British Empire itself is going to be regrouped by the war, and there is undoubtedly a hope of closer collaboration with the United States, while afterwards Europe will have to be organized on new lines.

The last war gave the Dominions their independence. Does it not appear already that the present upheaval may, mercifully, take the independence from all?

II. INDIA AND THE WAR

G. S. Brett

The contribution which India made to the success of the Allies in 1914-18 is known to have been extremely important. In the present war the resources of India, actual and potential, are much greater, and the help which the British can obtain from that country will play a large part in determining the final result. The geographical position of India is significant. Situated between Suez on the west and the Malay peninsula on the east, it is favourably placed for sending supplies or reinforcements of men to different points in the area of war. If the war should spread eastward, the forces of the enemy would be confronted by new armies, equipped from their own base, which could operate independently. At the present time Indian troops help to garrison Egypt, Aden, and Singapore; if necessary they can be brought to the West to serve with British troops as they did before. The fact that India includes in its population not only Hindus but also Moslems brings it into the wider range of the geographical and political area which comprises Turkey, Egypt, Arabia, and other Moslem spheres of

influence. The Moslems are said to number at least two hundred million: of these the largest single group is in India, amounting to about eighty million. Since the fall of the Caliphate in Turkey, there has been no central power which could claim to control or even represent this large mass of peoples, but unity of sentiment is possible and through the influence of India and Turkey the support of the great majority can be gained for the cause of the Allies.

The necessary limitation of exact reports on war activities may account for the fact that little has been said about what is being done in India. In the space available it will not be possible to give more than a brief summary of the main points, but an attempt will be made to indicate the nature and extent of the efforts undertaken to meet the demands of the present crisis. One important aspect of the whole matter is the attitude prevalent in the country. India comprises two political divisions, namely the provinces which come under the jurisdiction of the Viceroy, and the Native States governed by their own rulers who owe allegiance to the Paramount Power, the King-Emperor.

The attitude of the Native States is easily defined: their rulers speak for them in no uncertain manner; contributions of men and money have been placed at the disposal of the British administrators on a lavish scale; large donations of money have been made by the richer states, and gifts which are no less generous by those who have smaller resources. As examples mention may be made of Hyderabad, a state with a population of fourteen million inhabitants, which is providing a complete squadron of aeroplanes; of Bikanir, which has raised and maintains six battalions of infantry, as well as a camel corps; of Kashmir, which contributes two infantry battalions and one mountain battery. Several states provide motor ambulances, and others, too numerous to mention, are giving sums of money ranging from the gift of £11,200 by the Nizam of Hyderabad to smaller sums, based on a percentage of the monthly income and pledged for the duration of the war. As the number of Native States which may be considered important is between two and three hundred, and there are many more recognized states ranging from this group down to the smallest, it is impossible to give even a fair sample of the contributions or to estimate the total value in men, money, and equipment.

What is called for convenience British India, as distinct from

the Native States, offers a much more complex problem. The political issues in this area cannot be left out of account, because division of opinion has a definite relation to the success of the efforts being made to assure the victory of the British forces. But it is not necessary to discuss at this point the questions at issue between the political parties or to describe the present stage of India's progress toward self-government. In spite of legitimate differences of opinion and some inevitable bitterness of feeling, there is no reason to doubt that the true significance of the present state of emergency is appreciated by all parties. Arguments based on the failure of the British government to raise the standard of living, to make education more extensive, or grant more self-government, may be admitted as the expression of criticisms which should be heard; but that the true interests of India are integrated with the success of the resistance to Germany is not in dispute. In this, as in some other instances, the crude sincerity of the Nazi leaders in expressing their opinions of the "lower races" may prove a very effective factor in the formation of public opinion. Apart from those who directly support the war, the Radical Socialist group in the Congress party is naturally opposed to German views of government, and Mahatma Gandhi himself, though characteristically enigmatic, asserts that the first duty of the Indian people is to win the war.

It is in British India that the problems of administration and production are the concern of the government. Here as elsewhere the most important task is to provide the materials for this highly mechanized warfare. In August, 1940, the Indian correspondent of *The Times* could report that "the country is becoming a vast arsenal, supplying war materials for Indian forces at home and overseas and also for Great Britain, the Dominions and allied countries." A War Supply Board under an Indian Minister supervises and co-ordinates the various branches of the work. "In the first eight months of the war supplies from ordnance factories reached a peak which was touched only toward the end of the last war, and the steps taken to increase output will presently create records never before reached in India. Of the 40,000 items needed to equip a modern army more than 20,000 are already being produced in India."

During the period 1914-18, India supplied equipment and stores to the value of eighty million pounds sterling, in addition to raw

material and semi-manufactured articles. The capacity of the industrial system has expanded greatly since that time: for example, production of pig-iron reached a maximum in 1938-9 of 1,640,000 tons, which is equivalent to eight times the output recorded in 1913. The production of steel is now nearly thirty times what it was twenty-five years ago, the amount of steel ingots in 1938-9 being 922,000 tons and of finished steel 867,000 tons. Other important products are manganese, of which one million tons was exported in 1937-8, chromite and mica. Jute is a major product. Between 1935 and 1938 the quantity of jute products increased from one to two million tons, approximately. In the first thirteen weeks of the war, orders were placed to the value of eight million pounds sterling. Over one million sandbags per month can now be supplied. Khaki drill, cotton cloth, woollen cloth, and blankets are some of the things which India can provide. It is also important to consider the other part of the industrial situation: for not only does Great Britain benefit directly from this wealth of resources, but Germany is at the same time deprived of goods which she used to buy in large quantities, especially oil-seeds, vegetable oils, chromite, mica, rubber, hides and skins. As it is no longer possible for Germany to obtain these things, the importance of India can be measured by what Germany loses as well as by what the British acquire. To illustrate the activity in manufacturing it will be enough to say that fabricated steel buildings for Palestine and Egypt are being supplied to the value of £300,000; between one and two hundred thousand pairs of boots are made per month to meet the needs of different countries; field guns, anti-aircraft guns, bombs, land mines, and depth charges are being manufactured; one hundred million rounds of ammunition are being made to fill orders received from the British government, and three thousand armoured vehicles are to be delivered in 1941. The range of production is summed up in the phrase, "everything except automobiles and aeroplanes," and it is possible that before another year has elapsed factories will be constructed capable of adding these to the list of products.

For the present, industrial expansion takes precedence over recruiting. The call for volunteers met with a reception which quickly exceeded the immediate requirements, but if the situation changed and an offensive on a large scale was developed, the resources in man-power are very great. India maintains in peace-

time only a small standing army, about 150,000 men. During the last war about one and a half million men were sent overseas from India. Plans are now in operation for increase of the Indian Army: recruiting offices have been opened and recruits have been offering themselves in thousands. The aim at present is to increase the force by 100,000, with an ultimate objective of 500,000. The number of motor vehicles in use is to be raised from 5,000 to 32,000; five new battalions of the Indian Territorial Force are being formed; and a supply of officers for the new troops is guaranteed as a result of the scheme for "Indianizing" the Army, which began soon after the last war.

Though the word India is here used with special reference to the native population, it is necessary to remember that the number of European residents in India is large enough to be important in many ways. These are being called up for service as required and in many cases trained as officers; several hundred volunteers in this class are now waiting for their turn to be mobilized. The British residents in India, engaged in commercial and industrial occupations, and quite distinct from the class of government officials, naturally have strong sentiments of loyalty and need no encouragement to induce them to contribute personal services or money. The pattern of organization is very similar in all countries, as a consequence of the universal character of modern warfare. Protection against air raids and preparations for dealing with the possible results of such raids are as necessary in India as elsewhere, and there is plenty of work for civilians of all ages and classes.

Since the last war a Royal Indian Navy has been created. It is now mobilized for active service and is able to render valuable assistance in the work of patrolling the eastern seas. Co-operating with a number of armed merchant vessels, it constitutes an important addition to the naval forces available in those quarters. Last, but by no means least important, comes the Indian Air Force. It is stated on good authority that this branch of the Service has the greatest popularity. As a separate force it was officially created in 1932. On account, partly, of the great distances between the important cities of India, commercial flying has been developed with astonishing rapidity and success. Regular transport and mail services over routes such as that from Karachi to Calcutta have been in operation for several years. Consequently the

expansion of the Indian Air Force has been made possible by using those civil organizations for training pilots or taking over from them experienced fliers. Another source is the various clubs previously existing. Many of these were in Native States, where flying has been surprisingly popular. Probably many people unacquainted with India are convinced that its chief characteristic is lack of progress. In that case they will find these innovations rather incomprehensible. The great wealth of many of the Native States, combined with the tendency of the rulers to keep in touch with European society, accounts for the fact that flying has been so energetically developed. The Volunteer Air Reserve Force has been organized from these existing sources of supply. In July, 1940, the government initiated a plan to train three hundred additional pilots and two thousand mechanics. Schools for this purpose are located at Bombay and Calcutta: the technical training will serve not only to meet the probable needs of the Air Force as it continues to increase, but also as an educational project to train young men for future employment. The Air Force Selection Board will be able to refuse all but the most suitable candidates, as the first report stated that "many thousand applicants" appeared in excess of the number that could possibly be needed. As a sign of the enthusiasm which has been aroused, we may add the information that a voluntary enterprise in Calcutta, known as the East India Fund for British War Services, collected £176,000 to equip sixteen Spitfire aircraft. This unit is part of the Royal Air Force in England and has been in operation since July.

It has been said that India is not making a contribution to the war which is proportionate to the size and importance of the country. In terms of acreage and population this is not untrue. But it is necessary to remember that India is primarily an agricultural country, with great variations of climate and fertility. The mineral resources of the country are concentrated in a comparatively small area, and the commercial wealth is still more concentrated both geographically and in terms of the number of persons who can be regarded as rich. The critics of British rule in India are inclined to blame the government for all defects and shortcomings. That political question we are not undertaking to discuss, but as the last war initiated a period of activity in both industrial schemes and official organization, so the present crisis

is stimulating progress in many directions. As a result of this war India will rise to a new level of importance, and there is good reason to hope that in the near future the differences of opinion which are said to prevent full co-operation at the present time, will be eliminated.

III. CANADIAN LABOUR AND THE WAR

PHILIP CHILD

IT has become clear to most people that this war will be, on the one hand, a war of *matériel*, impossible to wage successfully without the whole-hearted co-operation of labour; and, on the other hand, a total war of *morale* in which conflicting ideologies concerned with the condition and future in the state of the working class will be used as propaganda weapons. In both respects our success will entail both restraint and sacrifices by capital and labour. These sacrifices will unquestionably be made provided that the real nature of the emergency, fraught as it is with a specific threat to every section of the democratic commonwealth, is clearly and persistently stated.

Those responsible for the defence of democracy have to weigh what may be gained in efficiency by adopting totalitarian methods of government *up to a point*, against the loss in morale and unity if the war-time curtailment of rights is carried too far. It would seem realistic and sensible to recognize that the appearance on the horizon of the totalitarian threat to the political system which guarantees our rights, does not cancel the long-range struggle of labour to preserve the position it has won under democracy, though the greater threat should impose a mutual restraint upon employers and workmen. Under the democratic system the struggle of labour to better its position has taken the form of trade and industrial unionization with the attendant rights to strike and to picket. While in war-time the state must exercise a measure of control over the rights of labour (as over the rights of capital), we should realize that in Canada organized labour feels far less sure of its rights than is the case in Great Britain, and consequently more suspicious of attempts, even under the necessity of war-time emergencies, to curtail them. At the outbreak of the war the right of labour to bargain with employers, through unions of its own choosing, was by no means the settled issue that it was in Great Britain. Nor had labour in Canada any

comparable representation in Parliament by a party specially devoted to safeguarding its interests. It would therefore be one thing for the British government (in the Cabinet of which both the Labour party and, less formally, the British Trades Union Congress are represented) to prohibit strikes, let us say, during the war; it would be quite a different matter for the Canadian government, which is without Labour representation in the Cabinet and which has a negligible Labour representation on the various boards controlling the industrial war effort, to do so. Again, it is worth remembering that during the depressed 'thirties the Canadian nation was, for various reasons, able or willing to do far less for the depressed classes than the United States or Great Britain and less than many other democracies. Consequently the Canadian government entered this world war of morale handicapped by a certain prejudice and suspicion on the part of workers.

Compared with Great Britain, Australia, and New Zealand, which have or have had Labour governments, the Labour movement in Canada is far less advanced. The proportion of organized labour to the total wage-earning population is far smaller in Canada. In 1938 the total union membership was estimated at 385,039—not a large proportion in a total wage-earning group of from two to two and a half million. Furthermore, within its own ranks organized labour has been divided by internecine struggles—between industrial and craft unions, national and international unions, Catholic "corporatism" and non-sectarian unionism. The reasons for this relative weakness of Canadian Labour, compared with that of other Dominions and Great Britain, need not concern us here.

What does concern us, if we are to understand tensions which might arise as a result of the industrial war-effort, is the nature of the principal union bodies in Canada, all of which represent different and sometimes conflicting trends of labour opinion, though they have ideas in common too. These bodies are as follows:

1. *The Trades and Labour Congress of Canada* is a parent body affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. It possesses autonomy in dealing with legislative matters affecting its affiliated unions in Canada, though in general policy it is limited in respect to action out of keeping with the policy of the A.F.L.[1] It is com-

[1]The following labour bodies are, after one designation, referred to by initials: Trades and Labour Congress of Canada (T.L.C.C.), Canadian Congress of Labour (C.C.L.), Canadian Federation of Labour (C.F.L.), the Confederation of Catholic

posed of international craft unions, but has some industrial unions and is empowered to charter trades and labour councils, provincial federations of labour, and local unattached federal unions. It co-operates closely with four large railway transportation brotherhoods on matters of mutual interest, though the latter are not directly affiliated with it or with the A.F.L. Its affiliated unions have autonomy over their own trades union affairs (wages, working conditions, etc.). For fifty-five years this body has been pre-eminent in the labour field. Its leadership has been conservative and responsible. Its primacy is now to some extent threatened by the new Canadian Congress of Labour. To hold its members, particularly its industrial unions, it may have to adopt a more aggressive policy. Its membership is 132,702.[2]

2. *The Canadian Congress of Labour* was formed last September by the merging of a national organization, the All-Canadian Congress of Labour, with the Canadian Committee for Industrial Organization (affiliated with the American C.I.O., but with a certain measure of autonomy for the Canadian affiliates) to form a new Congress containing "national" and "international" industrial-type unions. The A.C.C.L. element has been more conservative than the C.C.I.O. element. There was some internal opposition to the merger. One of its confusing results is that certain competing unions are linked together—e.g., the Canadian Steel Workers Union (A.C.C.L.) and the Steel Workers' Organizing Committee (C.I.O.). The link between the new Congress and the American C.I.O. requires some explanation. The Canadian Congress is not *constitutionally* linked with the C.I.O., but is completely independent; it can decide jurisdictional problems, draw up legislative programmes, etc. However, its affiliated C.I.O. unions *are* constitutionally under international discipline which could in a roundabout way result in American control. Unlike the Trades and Labour Congress, the Canadian Congress is wedded to the industrial union principle. It is the most aggressive labour body in Canada with respect to union organization,[3] and if it avoids internal dissension (it has within it more con-

Workers of Canada (C.C.W.C.); also the American Federation of Labor (A.F.L.), the [Canadian] Committee For Industrial Organization ([C.]C.I.O.), the All-Canadian Congress of Labour (A.C.C.L.).

[2]Paid-up membership. Precise total membership figures for congresses are unobtainable at present.

[3]*The Canadian Unionist* (C.C.L. Journal) announces that the most important task the new Congress has undertaken is the organizing of unorganized labour.

flicting elements than the Trades and Labour Congress) its membership may increase rapidly. At present it has 75,000 to 100,000 members.[4]

3. *The Canadian Federation of Labour* was formed in 1936 by a group which left the All-Canadian Congress. It has a small membership in Quebec, but is not an international federation. Its leadership is conservative, and it is inimical to radicalism and to "international" unions (a "propaganda term" according to the C.F.L.) which it accuses of half-heartedness and qualifications in their support of the industrial war-effort. Its membership (1938 figures) is about 50,000.

4. *The Confederation of Catholic Workers of Canada* (*La Confédération des Travailleurs Catholiques du Canada*) is almost exclusively French Canadian. It opposes American affiliation in trade unionism. Its aims are to provide a federation of unions free from American influence, in fact suitable to the French character and religion. It uses the term "Canada," rather than "French-Canadian," and hopes some day to have an English-Canadian Catholic section. It is opposed to the "neutrality" of other union bodies with respect to religious matters. It is stated to have in part escaped from "that doctrinal liberalism, the fundamental thesis of which was the separation of life into compartments certain of which, by definition, escaped religious influence."[5] It is strongly anti-communist, and has been at issue with other Canadian labour bodies over such matters as their support of the Popular government in the Spanish Civil War. In other respects its attitude towards trade unionism is unique in Canada and the United States: for instance, it considers that the strike as a labour weapon should not be taken for granted, since it is a non-Christian form of war which seriously exhausts both sides in a disagreement. Respect for property is one of its fundamental tenets. In general it represents as its ideal a form of Christian "corporatism" based on papal encyclicals. Its membership is about 50,000.[6]

That there should be further mergers between these bodies in the near future to form a united labour front is extremely unlikely,

[4]The hostile *Labour Review* (C.F.L. journal) asserts that the proportion of C.C.I.O. to A.C.C.L. in the Congress is probably 2 to 1. The Congress gives the proportion as equal. Announced membership is about 100,000.

[5]Fr. Richer in the Quebec quarterly *Culture*, Sept., 1940.

[6]Paid-up membership is about 16,000.

since each represents certain principles at present irreconcilable with those of others. That any of them should formally associate itself as a labour congress with a political Labour party is almost as unlikely at the present time, though there is a considerable sympathy between the two "congresses"—especially the C.C.L.—and the C.C.F. party. The C.C.W.C. is hostile to the C.C.F. because of the latter's socialism. In important labour questions the English-speaking bodies (all of which have some French-Canadian members) might, and in fact often do, co-operate. The co-operation of the C.C.W.C. is certainly less counted on by the others. At the present time members of both congresses and of the C.C.W.C. are sitting together on the National Labour Supply Council. The division between national and international unions does not prevent co-operation between the two congresses, since each already has both kinds of union.

Let it be said at once that Labour, taken as a whole, is heartily determined to do its part to win the war and will accept such hardships and sacrifices as it is convinced are necesssary for that purpose. It expects capital to make comparable and proportionate sacrifices.[7] Of the three English-speaking labour bodies the C.F.L. is the least critical of the government's war policies affecting labour (except with respect to what it calls "fostering labour organizations which tie the Canadian economy to that of the United States"[8]). International labour affiliations do not at the present time condition the attitude of the Canadian congresses toward the Canadian war-effort in any important respect. It should be remembered that the A.F.L. strongly supports the British cause. (The T.L.C.C. flatters itself that it did something to influence the A.F.L.'s attitude.) The American C.I.O. supports a defence programme for the United States, but opposed American conscription when it was first mooted. At the present time the American headquarters seem to be very anxious that nothing should be done in Canada to give the impression that the C.I.O. is in any way opposed to the war-effort. These

[7]Many, though not all, labour leaders think that *all* war industries should be nationalized. Many new war industries are. Some labour leaders (together with the C.C.F. and the Conservative opposition) support a "hundred per cent tax on excess profits." The government claims that such a tax would involve injustices as well as administrative problems of great difficulty.

[8]See *Labour Review*, Oct., 1940, also Nov., 1940. The *Labour Review* asserts that Canada is inviting trouble by tolerating—let alone encouraging—"the control of its industrial relations by the organizations of a neutral state."

disquieting facts remain however: that at the beginning of the war the American C.I.O. issued a statement which was anything but favourable to the Allied cause; that it is still suspected of having communist elements in its leadership in spite of its recent resolution condemning Nazism, Fascism, and Communism;[9] that when Canadian affiliates of the C.I.O. wished to buy bonds of the Second War Loan they had first to obtain the approval of American headquarters (however much that might be and was a formality); that the most serious Canadian strikes during the war have been in C.C.I.O. unions, often, it must be said, in defiance of superior union authority.

The following are some of the most important war-time problems affecting labour which confront the Canadian people at present.

1. *Unionization.* Organized labour is well aware that the triumph of a totalitarian régime, whether fascist or communist, would mean the extinction of trade and industrial unionism, and of the right to bargain collectively. Among unorganized labour, particularly among poorly educated workers, there is naturally a weaker conviction concerning "what we have to lose" by the defeat of democracy. Subversive agitators will certainly do their best to exploit scepticism and lack of a strong democratic conviction. This fact undoubtedly constitutes the best argument for a sweeping policy of unionization as a measure necessary to morale. This consideration would seem to outweigh in importance the danger of slowing up the industrial war-effort in the inevitable cases where employers fight unionization. Should the government actively enforce the right of labour to bargain with employers through unions of its own choosing? Many, though not all, labour leaders think so. Some of them point to the Wagner Labour Relations Act in the United States. Employers, who have no love for the radical leadership of the C.I.O. in the past, likewise point to it, but with a different intent. If Canadian labour bodies were given this active support by the government (a formidable *if!*), could they be trusted to use it with restraint and common sense? And would they as bodies support the government if need arose, as a result of the war-time emergency, to regulate the wages and working hours of labour? Would labour rise to the responsibility of the greater unity of the nation, or would the result be a series of suicidal nation-wide strikes? These are difficult questions to answer. One can only say that, in times like the pre-

[9]Ex-President Lewis asserted that those who say Communists influenced the C.I.O. "lie in their beards and lie in their bowels."

sent, governments must act with boldness and imagination, and in a democracy they must trust the people, if they are to survive.

Last June an Order-in-Council stated that the employees should be free to organize in unions without interference or control by employers or their agents, and that employees, through their agents, should be free to negotiate with employers concerning rates of pay, hours of labour, and other working conditions, with a view to concluding a collective agreement. It further provided that where differences arose that could not be settled by negotiations between the parties, the assistance of government conciliation should be sought. To this end the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act were extended to war industries as a means of avoiding interruption through strikes or lock-outs. The first of these provisions, in effect, *urges* employers to accept unionization as set forth, but does not compel them to do so. It is clear that many, if not most, employers in industries where labour is not organized certainly do not intend to accept unionization without a struggle.

2. *Strikes in war-time.* Labour regards the strike as a lawful means of bargaining. But the Canadian people have a right to expect that it will be used during war-time only with the greatest restraint and as a last resort in cases where employers have refused to accept the decision of conciliation boards (such cases have occurred). There have been too many irresponsible strikes, often against the orders of union officials. The President of the T.L.C.C. has asserted: "It is not lack of patriotism if workers seek by lawful means to establish wages and conditions which will enable them to maintain a decent standard of living for themselves and their dependents."[10]

3. *War-time regulation of wages, etc.* Labour would resent curtailment of its rights imposed arbitrarily without consultation.[11] It

[10]But the *Labour Review* (C.F.L.) thinks that the international unions are determined to exploit a seller's labour market. "The signs of today are plain to read. Demands for the state operation of industry during the war, attacks upon full penalty rates for overtime, and sporadic strikes and threats to strike, all these are indications of a mutinous attitude which distant dictators of union policy may exploit to the detriment of the industrial war effort."

[11]To quote the President of the T.L.C.C.: "There are two ways of approaching this question. One, the old paternalistic and often autocratic method of telling the workers what they must do and what is good for them, and the other, the sounder and more British method, of seeking to attain the same ends by voluntary co-operation."

will be on the alert to see that the necessities of a planned war-time economy, which, like all classes, it is prepared to accept, are not used as an excuse for the exploitation of labour. Labour leaders have been consulted in the preparation of an Order-in-Council to stabilize wages throughout the country in order to prevent a vicious circle of rising costs, and provision will be made for bonuses to compensate workers for rises in the cost of living.[12] These measures will be accomplished by means of directive orders to conciliation boards set up under the Industrial Disputes Act. The decision of the government to administer necessary wage regulation through conciliation boards is sensible and much fairer to labour. If, owing to increased purchasing power plus a shortage of consumer goods, the threat of inflation has to be met, it would be unjust and inefficacious to meet it merely by curtailing increases in wages unless there were a comparable or greater curtailment of profits on investment, accompanied by sound financing and by saving.

4. *Labour and the government's direction of the industrial war effort.* Both the T.L.C.C. and the C.C.L. think that organized labour should be represented on all administrative boards and commissions set up by the government to deal with the war industrial effort where the interests and welfare of labour are affected. At present labour is practically without representation on these boards (the National Labour Supply Council is an important exception). Most labour leaders do not want formal representation in the war-time Cabinet, and indeed there is no Canadian labour figure who, like Ernest Bevin, could speak with authority for labour as a whole.

5. *Labour and subversive activities.* No democracy, that is to say no country possessing freedom of speech, is without agitators, and Canadian labour is not without those who would, if they could, take the heart out of labour's war-effort. The congresses have, not without some internal opposition, supported local unions which expelled subversive elements and they have not as bodies opposed the government's action, under the Defence of Canada Regulations, in interning, without trial, individual radical labour leaders suspected of communism. There is, however, considerable opposition to these internments without public trial, and this opposition is by no means confined to the ranks of labour. Labour wants to be sure that under

[12]As far as possible these bonuses will be pegged to local cost conditions. The stabilization will apply to war industry, but it is hoped that other industries will fall into line.

the cloak of war hysteria no influence is brought to bear on the government, by forces hostile to labour, to intern leaders legitimately upholding labour interests—for instance, the right to strike.

* * *

It would seem to be the part of wisdom to recognize that *as a war of morale* the present war was (in the words of *The Times*) "preceded by revolutions and takes its character from them. . . . This war carries within it a clash of social orders and social purposes." "Nowhere in the world today," says Dorothy Thompson, "will the masses of workers give their full powers to their tasks for the sake of profit to a limited class. That is an inexorable fact of the twentieth century." On his side the enemy will not scruple to represent our cause as the effort of the "plutocracies" to exploit the worker and to preserve the economic *status quo* with its depression cycles, unemployment and dole, starvation in the midst of over-production. The totalitarian states will be represented as bringing a new order in which there will be jobs for all, discipline, and a more equal distribution of national wealth. . . . On our side we shall have to take pains not to be put on the defensive in the war of morale. Perhaps—not all will agree—the long-range trend of the world is toward some form of socialism, and one of the questions to be settled by the war is whether it is to be imposed and administered by a ruthless dictatorship, or achieved in an orderly way by the trial-and-error system of democracy. (Dictators are not error-proof either.) In any case, and as an answer to Hitler's propaganda, we shall have to revitalize the connotations of democracy in terms, on the one hand, of a more equitable distribution of wealth, and on the other hand, in such terms as to emphasize the *obligations* as well as the *rights* of the citizen of a democracy.

Hitler has little sense of justice and small regard for the rights of the working man, but he has realized that class antagonism was the principal source of disunity in the post-war world. He therefore attempted to "sublimate" the class struggle by a dynamic of aggressive nationalism and by giving every member of the state a task to perform. (The latter we could and should do as well as he.) Hitler's solution is a short-range solution, effective only while the imaginations of his followers are focussed on the seductive dream of German world domination. The "new world order" of Hitler cannot in the long run satisfy the yearning of mankind, bedevilled by the economic

malaises of the twentieth century, for greater security. But Hitler's dynamic will have to be met by a counter-dynamic that promises a better world for all than does his. We must have an answer for the people who ask: "What have I to lose by democracy's defeat?"

So much for our counter-dynamic in the war of ideas. At the same time, and in a very real and practical way, we shall have to defend ourselves against those who through blind selfishness, or with subversive intent, help to set capital at odds with labour. Purveyors of foreign and hostile *isms* will back each against the other indiscriminately, in order to sabotage our war-effort. Certain employers (fortunately a small minority), convinced of their own righteousness, will talk overmuch of the need for discipline—by which they will understand the right of the government (which they will try to control by interference and lobbying) to dictate the terms and conditions of employment and to curtail labour's freedom to bargain. Certain labour leaders (again fortunately few in number) will see the war only as a providential episode in the "class struggle," which they hope to exploit to the full, blind to the fact that they will be devising the suicide of democracy. There are unquestionably some employers (have they forgotten Thyssen?) who think that the "discipline" of fascism would give capital the upper hand over labour, and there are some labour leaders who have not faced the fact that if democracy is allowed to perish through selfish extremism, the rights of organized labour will perish with it. Most thoughtful Canadians will agree that the democracies are being tested before the world and that their members must show as great a unity and as much unselfish loyalty to the state as a whole in the cause of freedom as the totalitarian nations can show (or can be made to counterfeit) in the cause of a regimented autarchy.

IV. CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION — Lord Eustace Percy

War has set us of the Universities many problems of action, but it has set us also a problem of thought. And thought is, after all, our business.

The Empire has been told that it is defending Christian civilization. We accept that, but we cannot accept it lightly. If there be a Christian civilization, we are its chief guardians. It is our high privilege, the privilege of both students and teachers, not to

buy and sell knowledge, but to make men. If we believe that the manners which make men are essentially Christian manners, that belief must determine our conception of university life and learning.

Frankly, we of the twentieth century have not believed that. The codes and conventions which we call civilized are, indeed, derived from Christianity; but we thought they had outgrown their origins. And better so; they were thus safer from distortion by popes or presbyteries. They had become (so we assured ourselves) the settled capital fund of Western society, won and invested, secure against depreciation. The chief assets of that fund were democracy and science; therefore even the last war hardly shook our confidence in it. We had rid ourselves of Kaiserism and Csarism; we had extended the practice of parliamentary government; we had established a League of free Nations. Science was better endowed than ever before; more highly organized and more generally applied. Our fund had not shrunk; it had grown. Its latest investments might be a little shaky, but that would pass; youth would replace their shell-shocked elders and would make the world really safe for a scientifically enlightened democracy.

This being our creed, we were ready enough to patronize religion as a healthy moral influence, but its traditional language jarred on our ears. Forgiveness of sins?—why, yes; in the old phrase, it was God's business to forgive. "Through the weakness of our mortal nature we can do no good thing without thee"?—surely that was too abject a confession for the scientist and the social reformer. "Take not thy Holy Spirit from us"?—there could be no danger of that. In our private lives we might remain acutely sensitive to the truth of such language, but in our social affairs it had become almost meaningless. There, we had but the one fragmentary text: "Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord . . . but he that doeth my Father's will." The only public religion worth our recognition was a religion of social works.

Well, young and old, we were wrong. We had not securely invested our spiritual capital; we have been living on it. The old language has come terribly alive. We are back in the old world of tyrants and captivities, of idolatry and martyrdom. It is a world, not only of physical, but also of spiritual insecurity. We have seen generous impulses transmuted into wickedness; a Gestapo staffed by young men who in the beginning had been nobly intent on national regeneration, on a new equality and a new fellowship.

After all, it seems, the forgotten sequel to our favourite text is true: "Many will say to me, Lord, Lord... in thy name we have done mighty works, and I will profess to them, I never knew you . . . ye that work iniquity." A covenanted people may forsake the worship of God; forsaking that, may lose the knowledge of God's will; and, losing that, may wake to find itself bound to the worship of devils. It is possible for whole societies to fall from grace, leaving us to wonder how they can be renewed again to repentance. The salt can lose its savour. And there, but for the grace of God, goes the Empire.

But for the grace of God. That is the other side of our experience in these last months. It is too intimate for much speech, but we have seen these words, too, come alive in the face and voice of men who have gone out from us into the storm. Somehow, not by any care of ours, there still rests upon this people a blessing not to be accounted for by forms of government, or inherited decencies, or the enlightenment of science. If, at this hour, we dare at all to be confident, this is the ground of our confidence.

REVIEWS

IDEALS OF RELIGION[1]

Sir Robert Falconer

This volume contains the first course (the second was not delivered) of Gifford Lectures, given in Glasgow in 1907, by the late Andrew C. Bradley, formerly Professor of English in Glasgow University, and of Poetry in the University of Oxford. They were not published until 1940, Dr Bradley having suffered from a long illness during which he was unable to revise them. He died in 1935, and his sister, who was his literary executrix, transcribed the difficult manuscript with the invaluable aid of the late Professor Joachim who had "a sympathetic knowledge of Dr Bradley's philosophy." While there are sentences here and there, and even parts of a lecture, which might have been changed, and certain repetitions due to the lecture form which might have been removed, had Dr Bradley been able to carry out a revision, the reader is always conscious of the consistency of the thought and the simple beauty of the style.

To be invited to deliver a course of Gifford Lectures in one of the Scottish Universities has come to be regarded as a mark of distinction for the most eminent philosophers, philosophically-minded men of science and theologians in the world. The Foundation was due to Adam, Lord Gifford, a judge of the Court of Session in Edinburgh, who died in 1887. He left £100,000 to establish in the four Universities of Scotland lectureships "for promoting, advancing, teaching and diffusing the study of Natural Theology in the widest sense of that term—in other words, the knowledge of God." Today it is hard to realize the deep interest aroused by the creation of the Foundation. I heard Dr J. Hutchison Stirling deliver the inaugural course in Edinburgh in 1888. He had become one of the earliest interpreters for the English-speaking world of the Hegelian dialectic, when in 1865 he published *The Secret of Hegel*, though it was said that he had succeeded very well in keeping that secret to himself. The appointment of a prophet

[1] *Ideals of Religion: Gifford Lectures delivered in the University of Glasgow in 1907*, by Andrew C. Bradley, Macmillan [The Macmillan Company of Canada], 1940, $4.00.

of Hegelianism fluttered some in the stronghold of Scottish philosophy, but his lectures on "Philosophy and Theology" did not produce any striking effect such as many others did in later days.

In the course now under review, the quiet, beautiful, far-off voice of Professor Bradley carries us across the confusion of Pragmatisms, Realisms and Analyses to the confident and spacious days when Idealism of differing aspects held the scene. He begins his investigation of the ideals of religion by an analysis of the phenomenon as he sees it, in order to arrive at its distinguishing elements and at the way in which it seeks to satisfy human needs. Man, he holds, turns to religion with the practical purpose of escaping evil in himself and in the world, and thereby of obtaining good. The God whom he worships must, therefore, be a superhuman object who has power to do what man cannot do, and who excites in him either awe and fear, or gratitude, joy, and love. "Religion on its inner side is an act of the whole soul theoretical, emotional and volitional," a direction of the will to a superior being who is akin to the worshipper. Out of this active obedience and worship arises the disposition of piety.

It is obvious that religions differ from one another in their power to meet men's needs. Some are higher in the scale of development, some lower, in respect of ideas both as to God and as to man. But the higher religions contain remnants from the lower grades from which they have come, while a religion which has originated in a person of extraordinary genius becomes attenuated and coarsened as it spreads through inferior minds. The lines of advance are towards monotheism in correlation with the perception of unity in reason and in nature, towards a conception of the universal and infinite nature of God, and towards an intimate connection between morality and religion. Also the sanctity and security of man's religious beliefs are held to depend upon divine communication or revelation. Along with this goes a recognition by man that through the sacrifice of the lower desires he attains greater moral and spiritual good; and thereby his worship is spiritualized.

But some reject supernatural religion on the ground that it contradicts positive knowledge. The phenomenon is explained as a creation by man of God in his own image, a projection of his view into the outer world; and moral ideas are mere judgments of value. Though these religious and moral ideas are dismissed as truth, they may be retained as poetry if they seem indispensable under the

hard conditions of life. In an attempt to retain some religious values while escaping intellectual difficulties, recourse is had to forms of natural religion which do not go beyond explicable phenomena. Within the sphere of positive knowledge we find nature to be an object of admiration and awe; and the truth, beauty, and goodness of human life are a source of devotion and love. In these, it is claimed, may be found the essence of religion. Bradley holds that this is not sufficient. As religion this does not supply the power man needs, and morals invoke obligation to a law beyond the individual. It is of the nature of morality that man should believe that "his ideal and his judgments of value are true and essential expressions of the nature of things," and that there is "no total and ultimate separation of might and right." Nor is the worship of Humanity, as propounded by Comte, a satisfactory surrogate. The Comtist Man is no empirical individual, but a metaphysical figment, something non-phenomenal. Passing by his discussion of the inadequacy of the ideals of Seeley and Mill, we come to the evolutionary view that matter has "the promise and potency of all that issues from it," and that the double-sided universe is a process in which conscious mind emerges "like a giant labouring in a dream." But again, the idea of progress does not satisfy man's needs, even if we were sure that the process will not be reversed. Man lives in the present in which he must find good for himself as the end of his own life. He suffers here and now from evil, and he wants freedom from it. The idea of future perfection is insufficient to relieve present imperfection. "What will the perfection of the future—what would even our own present perfection, if we had it—avail the millions who have suffered and sinned in the past and have vanished from the earth?" "Religion wants the ideal actually realised." No abstract idealism will provide this; nor does philosophic Brahmanism, which attempts to escape from evil by regarding all finite existence as a vain show, and by professing that it is an illusion. There must be concrete idealism.

Here Bradley begins the most important part of his lectures. With less digression than heretofore, he works out his own construction of the religious ideal. "What is required is that the infinite should negate the finite in such a way as to include it."

> A man's renunciation of the world as merely finite, as the opposite of God, is the new birth of that world as the manifestation of God, which he accepts as such

and rejoices in and loves as beautiful and good. Religion may be called man's release from evil, his present release, not something merely future. Not that through it he escapes the sufferings and sorrows of a finite being, but he has determined to reckon as his true self only that self which is at one with God, and for him as thus one with God nothing, whether sorrow or joy, can come which is not God's will and therefore good. . . . This is at once the essence and the paradox of religion. . . . Nor can religion have [present release from evil] without belief in one eternal perfection wholly free from evil, and without itself taking on one side, "even here, upon this bank and shoal of time," this eternal point of view.

In what follows there is a long discussion of the question as to the truth of the ideas which have been arrived at. Are our religious impulses merely our desires and powerless to satisfy the intellect? On the question of truth the intellect must have its say: "The intellect cannot receive on authority, it can do nothing but understand." But the religious man cannot avoid the conviction that what is essential to his religion must be true. Attempts are made of various sorts to escape the conflict which often arises between the intellect and religious ideas. Some interpret religion as a mere product of the imagination; others as a matter of feeling, confining it thereby to one element of its nature; others again take refuge in the certainty of the ideas in a vivid experience, ignoring the difficulty that, if mere certitude were a proof of truth, all religious convictions, if held with equal certainty, might be equally true. Religious experience must be so interpreted as to satisfy the intellect, though the intellectual interpretation is not religion. Elements in religions arising from historic, aesthetic, or philosophic origins in so far as they clash with present knowledge or thought may be removed often without loss of religious value. But even then we shall not have reached an essential core which is absolutely true. This essential core may be called a revelation of the presence of the infinite in man. To endeavour to conceive the infinite in finite terms, and to express truths which knowledge does not even try to grasp, carries us beyond our capacity. "For religion ultimate or absolute truth is not a matter of prime importance." To reach that is the endeavour of philosophy, not of religion. Religion is an act of the whole soul seeking union with God, not even primarily through thought.

Truth and reality are matters of degree. Science takes its objects in more or less isolation from the whole, and a statement which might be quite true within a limited scientific sphere, is by no means true as a statement of ultimate reality. "The perceptible

tree is an immense distance from being the whole or real tree. The real tree, the only absolutely real tree, is the tree in its place in the whole." "There is only one perfectly true idea, that of the all-inclusive infinite." "The poetic view of nature is obviously different from the views both of common-sense and of science; and according to them it is untrue: because the poet attributes to nature what belongs not to it but to mind; such as emotions of sadness or joy due to experience of human life." But the nature of poetry is much nearer than the nature of common sense or even science to the real nature, which includes all these and goes beyond them. In this argument Bradley would be challenged today by a variety of philosophers, not all of them absolute realists, for his interpretation of man's relation to the universe. Much water has flowed under the bridge since he wrote, and recent mathematical concepts and discoveries in physics have presented thinkers with new problems as to the meaning of reality.

Religious ideas, however, differ from those of poetry in that they do not spring from the imagination, though they are often coloured by it. They are based on an experience which carries the conviction that they are true, even if, as we have seen, they are not absolutely true. In fact the sensuous and imaginative medium which is essential to poetry produces difficulty when efforts are made to express spiritual truths in forms which are inadequate. "The imagination or semi-sensuous understanding, trying to represent [the intimate union of the soul and God], half represents it and half belies it." Perfect truth could not be received in its own likeness. When the religious man seeks to express his ideas about God in theological or metaphysical terms, he is aware that they are imperfectly true, and that there is a realm of meaning behind them which he is unable to capture with the intellect alone. The effort is being constantly made to adjust the religious ideas which have been transmitted from a distant past, and have been coloured by its atmospheres, to the philosophic and scientific views of the time. The truth of ideas which are essential for religion is more than historical accuracy; it is concerned with the meaning behind the facts. Philosophy may clarify some of these ideas, but it can never take the place of religion. Intellect offers only one aspect of reality. The important matter is whether the ideas about God are sufficiently true or adequate to enable the worshipper to bring

his will into union with him. The imagination may dilute the truth of religious ideas:

> Unless restraint is laid on it, it always tends to surround spiritual greatness with an atmosphere of astounding physical occurrences, to translate inward achievements into abnormal outward events or actions. Or, in later days, passing by as commonplace the miracles of self-control, endurance, faith and love, which are performed day by day in country cottages and the streets of cities, it hunts for the witness of God in occult regions where the light is so dim that it can see what it chooses, and the voices so faint that they seem to speak unutterable things. The work of the imagination, in its own proper world of free creation, needs no acknowledgment; but it is a genie whose services to religion, invaluable as they have been, are never bought for nothing.

In briefer outline than could be desired, Bradley discusses whether the idea of an infinite being is true and has reality. It seems that he intended to deal with this subject more fully in the second course of lectures which he never delivered. A philosophic idealism, similar to that of his brother F. H. Bradley, constitutes the framework of his thought; but his religious experience gives it vitalizing beauty, as in early summer fresh foliage does to the shaping branches of a stately tree. "Final reality cannot mean something totally unknown or of which there is no idea—for that is a self-contradiction; it means something totally and finally known." "Reality ultimately must mean the whole of experience conceived by absolute mind." "Thus absolute truth and absolute reality are the same, and both are the same as absolute mind." That this interpretation may be unsatisfactory to many, he says, is due to our "always hungering after the preposterous notion of a sensible infinite." "Everything finite is a partial appearance or manifestation of the infinite." "The infinite is the unity of all differences, a unity so pervasive that every difference or part, truly apprehended, would reveal the whole." The infinite, however, is not merely the aggregate of all finite existences, which would be pantheism, but a full, variegated unity, spiritual because it concentrates in itself so much difference, the higher taking up into itself, in its intense whole, the experiences of the lower. When the finite is carried into the infinite it becomes richer because it parts with elements of its own finitude, its isolation and exclusiveness; just as a note when it enters into a melody does not cease to be, but becomes a function of a wider whole. In this conception of the infinite Bradley tries to escape the danger that his thought leads him to the absorption of the personal individual in the

absolute, by interpreting the doing away of separation as a form of love. The absolutely spiritual "might, in a sense, be called absolute love, because the egoism of the parts has vanished, and each freely communicates its being to every other." By dying to the isolation of my individual self, I find my spiritual, real self in loving and serving my friends, or family, or society, or my country.

> A soul, an atom which feels and knows, can hold out no more appalling prospect to itself than to exist for ever and ever in absolute isolation; and goodness, which is peace, is in all its forms the dying of this illusory atomic centre into the life of others with which it forms a whole; and the stirring of religion is the feeling that my only true self in the end is God. . . . Is that to lose my life, my individuality, or to find it? . . . It is to find it, if the true being of the finite is to be . . . a distinction of the infinite, a note in the music of the spheres, or a word whose meaning is God.

Also God is perfectly realized in a world of spirits reconciled with himself, which is an abstract description of the Kingdom of God. "The truth, the secret of things, God, is not something far off and clouded in impenetrable mystery; it is within us, and the very centre of our being, and we have only to look there to find it."

"Evil is the attempt at the complete separation of the part from the whole." "Evil seems in some way to be involved in the existence of good." Religion gives release from evil and turns it to good by a man's identifying himself with the divine will. But to understand how evil is essential to good, and "what it would look like from the centre" is beyond us. Of this, however, we may be sure, of evil there is none in the infinite. "Those cases where pain is present, yet absorbed in joy, at least suggest the idea that the suffering of the finite, especially in its noblest forms, may in the divine life not be so wholly neutralised as to disappear, but, however changed, may survive as an essential condition of the glory which enshrines it there as here." Thus end these lectures by a deeply religious and poetic thinker. More even than most idealist philosophers, A. C. Bradley is in the succession of Plato, "a lover of reality as a whole." He is also kindred in spirit to the modern Platonist, his contemporary Robert Bridges, poet laureate. Both regard religion as the bond of love between the human and the divine:

> whose Being is thatt beauty and wisdom
> which is to be apprehended only and only approach'd
> by right understanding of his creation;

both believe that

the spirit of man
escaping from the bondage of physical Law
re-entereth eternity by the vision of God.[2]

Bradley finds in the partial spiritual experience of present love, beauty and truth, the earnest of transcendent union with the divine.

[2]*The Testament of Beauty*, IV, 1084 ff., 128 ff.

FOREIGN NEWS AND THE PRESS*

B. K. Sandwell

Canada is obviously a difficult country in which to secure an adequate and competent dissemination of news. Its populated area is over three thousand miles long and nowhere very deep. Although it has a population of twelve million, it has only two population areas geographically suitable to be catered to from a single centre of publication but containing more than a million people and therefore capable of sustaining a metropolitan journal, or several such. One of these is the area within reach of Toronto, whose newspapers have probably well over two million people to circulate among, all of one language and of a fairly uniform standard of living. The other, the area around Montreal, has nearly as many people, but divided into two languages and including elements with a much lower standard of living. The remaining seven or eight million people are strung out over an enormous length of country, containing only two secondary publishing centres of importance, Winnipeg and Vancouver, neither of which can cater to more than a very small fraction of the whole. Of these four centres, it is interesting to note that only two are the seats of even provincial governments, and that the national government is situated in a city which is not a publishing centre at all.

Mr McNaught's volume is "an attempt to describe . . . the way in which foreign news is gathered and presented for Canadian consumption." Foreign news, of an intelligent kind, is the most difficult and expensive to procure, and the most unprofitable to print,

**Canada Gets the News: A Report in the International Research Series of the Institute of Pacific Relations*, by Carlton McNaught. Issued under the auspices of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs. Ryerson Press, Toronto, 1940, $3.50.

of all the different kinds of news carried by a newspaper. (Sporting news is probably the cheapest and most profitable. The Montreal *Gazette*, a unique "class" newspaper for business men with a five-cent price, is probably the only newspaper in Canada which could not afford far better to omit, let us say, the death of the Prime Minister of Japan than the result of even a minor league hockey game.) It is therefore not surprising to find that the operations of the Canadian press in this field are far from being satisfactory to anybody who feels that Canada is destined to have an important influence in international affairs and who would like to have that influence wielded in accordance with an enlightened public opinion.

As a description of the complicated process of the securing, selecting, and presenting of foreign news, this book is admirable. As a criticism of that process, it is itself subject to the criticism that it represents an extremely special point of view. What that point of view is, is partly suggested by the fact that the volume constitutes part of a series proceeding from the Institute of Pacific Relations. (Its sponsorship is undertaken by the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, perhaps because the Pacific Institute is not strong enough in Canada to carry the burden.) It is further, and very definitely, indicated by the stress laid upon the Canadian handling of one very difficult (from the newspaper angle) incident of chiefly Pacific concern, the kidnapping of Chiang Kai-shek, which alone occupies nearly one-eighth of the book. It is the point of view of persons with a very special and serious interest in Canada's relations with the Orient—an interest which it would be absurd to describe as being at all widespread among the Canadian population. A limitation of journalism, which differentiates it from state education (or used to before even state education became largely a matter of elective courses), is that it cannot compel its readers to read news in which they are not interested; it is therefore quite useless to spend money on getting it for them merely because they ought to be interested in it.

Foreign news, like foreign exchange, is most easily dealt in through a few great centres of exchange. London and New York are both great centres of exchange; but because New York is much nearer to Montreal and Toronto, Canadian dealings in even sterling exchange used to be handled almost entirely in that city. Similarly the "natural" centre for the purchase of foreign news for Canadian newspapers is also New York. There is a large wholesale supply of

it there, and Canadian newspapers used to rely pretty heavily on that market. But sterling and Hong Kong dollars are the same wherever you buy them, whereas news takes on a colouring from the particular market for which it is intended; and Canadians early found out that the New York colouring, especially in matters affecting the British Empire, was not exactly what Canada desired. They therefore began setting up their own buying agencies in London, where the stuff could be had without the American colouring. Mr McNaught seems to feel that even what they get in London is slightly the wrong colour for the Canadian market; for he observes that the avowed policy of the Canadian Press in London (to "descry the British, which is the Canadian, point of view") is likely in practice to present to Canadians "merely the view of a particular section of British opinion, or of a particular British government." This is perfectly true, but it is a defect inherent in all "agency" forms of reporting, forms, that is, in which the report is the property, not of a single newspaper or a chain of newspapers under one ownership, but of a great number of independent papers co-operating to get it, as in the case of the Canadian Press. There is no one British point of view, no one French point of view—though there is, alas! only one German point of view that matters,—and the only way for Canada to get a complete picture of British politics would be for several Canadian newspapers to have their individual correspondents in London, each drawing from, and sympathetic to, a different *milieu*. On the lack of this kind of correspondence Mr McNaught is very clear and emphatic; but it is a lack which arises out of the smallness of the main journalistic markets in Canada, and the lack of demand for intelligent *critical* handling of foreign news from the readers of the financially prosperous papers. What special London correspondence there is in the great-circulation papers is done by clever and expensive men, but it is done much more with an eye to the picturesque and the sensational than to the politically informative. It has to be; there is a demand for that kind of thing, which rewards the successful purveyor of it with large circulation and consequent heavy advertising from the departmental stores, while there is very little demand for an accurate reflection of the views on world affairs of the British Labour party, the Lloyd George Liberals, or even the Round Table.

Mr McNaught is much too generous in his estimate of the space devoted to "foreign" affairs by the Canadian newspapers; for he

includes in "foreign" news all that which originates in the United States, and this ranges from one-third to two-thirds of the "foreign" total. But a very large amount of the news originating in the United States is in no sense "foreign" to Canada. An interest in a hockey game in Chicago is not an interest in foreign affairs; space devoted to a good Detroit murder in Western Ontario papers proves nothing except that Detroit is only a few miles away. That, even with the American news deducted, twenty-five Canadian dailies devoted a larger *proportion* of their space to "foreign" matters than does the *New York Times* also proves nothing, except that none of these papers has the same enormous supply of first-rate domestic news that a good New York paper can draw upon. The statement that three Canadian dailies, in the week of Mr McNaught's survey, had a greater *amount* of foreign news than the *New York Times* looks impressive, until one recalls that the total includes all the American sporting and financial information. The survey was made in the summer of 1937.

A much more interesting survey, also included in this volume, is that which shows the number of words out of the total Canadian Press supply for the day used by six different large-city papers on the afternoon of November 27, 1936. This is valuable because the data are genuinely comparable in all six instances, though it would have been better if the survey could have been repeated four or five times at slight intervals, to lessen the influence of pure chance. (The date is in the period of heavy Christmas advertising, when all newspapers are carrying an unusually large number of pages and have plenty of space.) The C.P. transmitted some 13,800 words; and of this the *Montreal Star* and the *Toronto Telegram* used 10,700 and 10,500 respectively, a very praiseworthy showing. The *Toronto Star* and the *Winnipeg Free Press* used only 5,000 and 4,000. This goes to suggest that the excellence of the *Free Press*'s foreign matter on its editorial page (which is, of course, not included in these "news" totals) may be due rather to the special interest of its editor than to any urgent demand for good foreign information on the part of its readers; the quality of an editorial page affects prestige rather than circulation, and many papers with a negligible editorial page have magnificent circulations, and *vice versa*.

Mr McNaught makes plain that the weaknesses of the supply of foreign news disseminated to Canadians are chiefly due to the fact that it is procured by an agency acting for a large number of

newspapers of different "tendency." This fact does little harm in the case of news relating to crime and accidents, for the news material in that case is really "factual." But news relating to international affairs is not composed of the kind of facts that one can swear to in a court of law. There are very few facts, and what matters is the relative importance assigned to them, the interpretation put upon them, and the conjectures by means of which the blanks between them are filled in. The process of classifying, interpreting, and filling in, is necessarily and inevitably "tendentious"; it will be performed differently according to the leanings and associations of the person doing it. But a news agency must not be tendentious; all the different papers that it serves have their own tendencies differing one from another, and they expect the agency to favour none of them. The result is an agency service which is really tendentious (because it cannot help being) while pretending not to be—obviously the most dangerous kind. Mr McNaught is not very hopeful about remedies, and says very little about one means by which a considerable improvement might be effected, namely the extension of "chain" newspaper ownership and the use of able and well-trained correspondents to supply an entire chain. So far the chain system in Canada has not been extended to the two first-rank publishing centres, Montreal and Toronto, but there seems to be no reason why it should not be, and a Toronto paper with affiliates in half-a-dozen smaller centres could afford a foreign service of its own which it could hardly carry alone. But the main burden of complaint is one for which no remedy is visible. Canada has not got a *New York Times* because Canada has not got a New York.

THE DEFENCE OF CANADA*

A. R. M. Lower

The title of Mr Stacey's book indicates its nature: it is a survey of our defence arrangements, past and present, together with a consideration of certain aspects of strategy. The book thus forms a useful compendium and one is enabled to find by its aid the more necessary of the points of detail that enter into the development of Canadian military forces. Information is available on

**The Military Problems of Canada: A Survey of Defence Policies and Strategic Conditions, Past and Present*, by C. P. Stacey, Ryerson Press, 1940, $2.50.

such points as the year in which a General Officer Commanding was first appointed, the Hutton Report of 1898, and the beginnings of the Canadian Army Service Corps. There is also some exposition of the more general problems of strategy and of defence politics as they have unfolded in Canada.

The scope of the book may be judged by its chapter headings: "Geography and Canadian Security," "The Military Institutions of an Unmilitary People," "Canadian Defence Policy to 1914," "The Great War and After," "The New Defence Policy," "The Second World War." About one-half the space is devoted to chapter III, "The Great War and After," about one-third to chapter I. The attention given to the other topics is therefore limited.

Mr Stacey's chapter on geography and strategy embodies most of the pertinent material developed by writers on this subject during the last few years, but his interests plainly lie in the detail of military establishment. There are a few points in this first chapter to which exception might be taken. The most important is his rather summary dismissal of Hudson Bay as a region of danger for settled Canada. The reviewer, never inclined to be alarmist on the question, is not so sure that the threat is as slight as Mr Stacey seems to think. For this, good reasons could be given. In his enumeration of the difficulties that would face a foe attacking Canada, difficulties which he rightly calls stupendous, he omits to mention one of the most formidable to a frontal attack on the St. Lawrence: the relatively short open season in the river.

The author gives rather too much valuable space to the Bren gun affair, now best forgotten, and to the proposed Alaska highway, a secondary matter now that we have linked our fortunes in defence to the United States. Incidentally, the book has been written under obvious difficulties, since events outdistance any author these days.

It is interesting to have the authoritative statement (though it will be disappointing for many Canadians) that even the largest of bombing planes have a radius (with three-fifths load) of only about 900 miles. Similarly, the examination of the extreme range of battle fleets (and the author has been generous) should dispel the many quaint notions on the subject likely to be held by the layman who reads the book.

In the later chapters, apart from points of detail, Mr Stacey seems most concerned with finding an explanation for the complacency of Canadians regarding military preparation in time of

peace. There are a dozen of them. One or two are given, but it seems to the reviewer that the chief lies in the simple fact that Canadians have never felt they were fighting their own wars: they were either in danger of becoming the recipients of American blows dealt at Great Britain, or they were fighting abroad as subordinate parts of a greater whole. If it were desirable to turn Canada into a heavily armed country in peace-time it could be accomplished only with an increase of initiative and responsibility.

Mr Stacey suggests that the refusal to arm "may not have been in accord with the teachings of history." On the whole, it was in accord with the teachings of Canadian history, which is what we have mainly to go by, here in Canada.

The author has a nice sense of understatement as when he says: "In the past her [Canada's] interests have not always completely coincided with those of either [of the two great Anglo-Saxon powers] and even today, it is fair to say that there is only one capital where those interests . . . are fully understood and that capital is neither London nor Washington." Or again: "The standard of information and judgment displayed on military topics in Canadian parliamentary debates was not especially high."

The book performs with reasonable success the purpose for which it was intended: it is a manual of information on certain phases of a subject of much current interest. It is difficult for anyone to put together something of this sort for a semi-public body without making it into a mere handbook—or having it so made for him! In such a compilation it would be out of place for the author to go very far in suggestion and criticism, or even in expressing himself on a level much above the pedestrian. More vital writing must be reserved for a more vital type of book.

THE MASTER AND HIS FELLOWS*

DOUGLAS BUSH

Throughout his career Professor Stoll has never been diverted from one high aim, the appreciation of great works of art. Although his favourite ground, Elizabethan drama, is encompassed by quick-

*_Shakespeare and Other Masters_, by Elmer Edgar Stoll, Harvard University Press, 1940, $4.50.

sands, he has not slipped into the disentangling of minor collaborators, or the reinterpreting of Shakespeare's plays as *romans à clef* or as case-books of psychology, or whatever the scholarly fad of the moment may be. Mr Stoll has always preferred to seek support among men of the theatre and poets rather than among scholars; the former may have their uncritical vagaries but at least their dramatic and poetical instincts can be counted upon. Mr Stoll himself seems to have been at home all his life in the many mansions of drama and dramatic criticism, Greek, Roman, Italian, French, Spanish, German, Scandinavian, English, and American. With such an unrivalled and intimate knowledge of the world's masterpieces, he has been able to concentrate on the great artistic problems and to bring to them a remarkably pure, sensitive, and fresh imaginative perception.

Within the Shakespearean field it is Professor Stoll's distinction that he more than any other individual has helped to kill the romantic tradition of undramatic criticism. That tradition, established by Coleridge, Lamb, and their fellows, ruled the nineteenth century and had its last great expression in the early twentieth, in the work of Bradley. Mr Stoll has never been blind to the virtues of the romantic sensibility, and has constantly quoted its finer intuitions; but he has also constantly exposed the general and particular fallacies which resulted from taking Shakespeare off the stage and into the study, from taking the characters out of the plays and into life. Some critics and scholars before him had rebelled against that tradition and approached Shakespeare as "good theatre," but they did not translate an attitude into an elaborate interpretation both broad and minute. If the "theatrical" view of Shakespeare is now a commonplace, we should not forget that once upon a time Mr Stoll was a voice crying in the wilderness. And to read his present essay on *The Tempest*—or to discover the opinions undergraduates bring to college or even acquire there—is to be reminded that he is not flogging dead horses. The eminently sane Sir Edmund Chambers can not only espouse the view that Prospero is Shakespeare but suggest that Ariel "may be a symbol of the spirit of poetry found pegged in the cloven pine of pre-Shakespearean drama." When gold rusts, what shall iron do?

Mr Stoll's new volume is a collection of essays gathered from periodicals, and revised and mostly a good deal enlarged in the process. After a prologue on what criticism is not, the author

proceeds to show by example what it is. The titles of the essays are: "The Dramatic Texture in Shakespeare"; " 'Reconciliation' in Tragedy: Shakespeare and Sophocles"; "Shakespeare and Jonson: Characterization and Tradition"; "Hamlet the Man"; "Othello the Man"; "Othello and Oedipus: Corneille, Rymer, and Voltaire"; "Iago"; "The Tempest"; "*Phèdre*"; "Tartuffe, Falstaff, and the *Optique du Théâtre*"; "Art and Artifice in the *Iliad*: or the Poetical Treatment of Character in Homer and Shakespeare"; "The Tragic Fallacy, So Called." To us at the present time, and assuredly to Mr Stoll himself, such subjects seem remote enough, but we can try to remember that these will go onward the same, though dynasties pass. And however widely the author roams, the book is a unified whole.

The essay on Shakespeare's dramatic texture rightly appears at the beginning; for it expounds the critical creed of which the other essays are mainly special applications. The chief articles are indicated in such sentences as these:

> For in general the method is not one of analysis. Shakespeare's leading characters, men or women, may or may not have a "*ruling* passion" but, including Coriolanus, they are not the embodiments of it—not of ambition or hatred, of love or jealousy, of honor or patriotism, not of "wrath" in Lear or of "sloth" in Hamlet, not of moral, religious, or artistic aspiration, of a desire for wealth, knowledge, power, fame, beauty, or eternal salvation, whether these singly or as pitted against another. . . . But if there is not much analysis there is description —there is presentation—enough. We know all we need to know. As we shall see, the characters vividly, if not clearly, reveal their own natures, and (as arising from the situation) their feelings and purposes. Yet they have passions rather than principles; are guided by impulses, good or bad [p. 21].

> And the Elizabethan suggestiveness is primarily poetical. It is imaginative and emotional rather than logical or psychological, immediate rather than inferential, and it has to do not so much with the inner nature or mechanism of the character as with the situation or the structure of the play as a whole. Reasons and motives count for less . . . than contrasts and parallels, developments and climaxes, tempo and rhythm, or even the identity of the individual utterance [p. 25].

> It is by poetry that Shakespeare, like the other Elizabethans and the great ancients, overrides the restrictions of realism in circumstance, logic, and psychology . . . and in speech [p. 40].

> In tragedy the emotions have the stature of passions, and in the development of them and opposition of them lies the centralizing and unifying force rather than in the characters [p. 52].

Approaching Shakespeare by such a road, understanding his

purposes and the liberty and limitations of his stage, Mr Stoll gets rid at the outset of countless "problems" foisted upon the plays by undramatic criticism old and new, the manifold contradictions existing among the various elements of drama, speeches, motives, conduct, and consequences. Every tragedy is an artistic entity, not to be judged by mechanical theories of tragic flaws. Although Shakespeare presents characters with far more rounded fulness and actuality than the ancients, he is not, like the modern dramatist, bound to verisimilitude, consistency, and prosaic rationality. He is intent upon obtaining the maximum of emotional effect from the plot, whether it is novel or familiar. And in the popular theatre the maximum of effect, the only possible effect, is got through bold and immediate strokes, not through veiled hints and doubtful symbols. Subtlety there is, in abundance, but open and palpable subtlety. The psychological and other puzzles revealed by the student's magnifying-glass are not noticed by the spectator, who is carried away by the human beings, the story, and the poetry. In the theatre of word and action Hamlet offers no difficulty, nor does Falstaff. (In his view of Falstaff, I confess, Mr Stoll does not take me with him.) For the sake of his main object Shakespeare can afford risks because we believe in the character whatever he does. Even Jonson, the most modern of the Elizabethan dramatists, convinces at least as much by the individual accent of his persons as by his verisimilitude.

Such a glance at some of Mr Stoll's critical principles, being inevitably brief, is as unfair to this as to any one of his books, since the proof of the pudding is in the eating, in the detailed commentary upon scene and character, single notes and orchestration. But one aspect of this book may be emphasized, the fruitful extension of the critic's method to other fields than Shakespeare. He has always ranged freely in French drama, with a degree of sympathy rare in English-speaking critics, and here he offers several special studies. Then Shakespeare and Sophocles, the romantic and the classic artist *par excellence*, are both shown to be supremely interested in emotion and action, in character, and, though the Greek is more religious, even he does not make a philosophic attempt to justify the ways of God to men; both dramatists bring us face to face with the insoluble mystery of pain and evil. Finally there is the *Iliad*, which we are accustomed to take for granted. Mr Stoll's analysis of the structural pattern and tonality, in comparison with Shakespearean

devices, throws suggestive light upon Achilles and Hector and the nature of Homeric art.

Some Shakespearean critics have conceived of Mr Stoll as one who comes, in the words of Chesterton's poem, to straighten out the crooked road an English drunkard made, and he in turn has not been disinclined to "bash their baggonets." If Mr Stoll has had a Baconian dislike of fallacious "idols," he has also been a sort of Bacon in his fundamental belief that we must enter the kingdom of dramatic art, not as a little child to be sure, but as a human being. And, far from seeking to diminish Shakespeare's stature, he has laboured to exalt it, to explain, but never to explain away, the magician's power. In this volume there is little controversy, though a few wisps of smoke drift across the pages, and the author is always at his happiest and best when he forgets critical frailties and confronts a great work of art directly. He can then give himself up, not merely to the noble pleasure of praising, but to the still nobler pleasure of active and penetrating elucidation.

FOR STUDENT AND GENERAL READER*

ARTHUR E. CASE

The renascence of scholarly interest in Swift which began some fifty years ago with the work of Forster, Craik, and Stephen, had its fitting culmination at the turn of the century in Temple Scott's edition of the prose works. After a comparatively quiet period, in which the notable contribution was Ball's edition of the correspondence, there began at the close of the last war a second burst of activity in the field, which has now happily brought us admirable editions of the poetry, by Mr Harold Williams, and the prose, by Professor Herbert Davis. Though the latter is now President of Smith College, I use his former academic title by design, as a reminder that students of Swift still lay claim upon the administrator for a good portion of the scholar's time. The

*_The Prose Writings of Jonathan Swift_, edited by Herbert Davis, Blackwell, Oxford, 1939. Vol. I, _A Tale of a Tub, &c._; Vol. II, _The Bickerstaff Papers, and Pamphlets on the Church_; Vol. III, _The Examiner and Other Pieces Written in 1710-11_, 12s. a volume.

yet uninterrupted issuance of the volumes of the prose works is encouraging evidence that the claim will be recognized.

Mr Davis has tried in these volumes to serve both the amateur and the professional reader of Swift, and some of the advantages he offers to both are evident even on casual examination. Since this edition is to contain in fourteen volumes material which Temple Scott printed in eleven, it has been possible to use larger and more legible (and, incidentally, more beautiful) type. The professional reader will rejoice that eighteenth-century spelling and typography have been retained, and the general reader will not be seriously incommoded. Advantage has been taken of modern work on the canon: spurious and doubtful works have either been eliminated or, where they are of interest, printed in appendices. The chronological arrangement of the writings has made it possible to give in the introduction to each volume the appropriate biographical information. These introductions also provide excellent critical commentaries: here Mr Davis has made thorough use of the discoveries of twentieth-century scholarship, in which his own part has been by no means the least. In addition he has included in his introductions the most important background material for the elucidation of the texts, dispensing with explanatory foot-notes in the body of the book in order not to risk interruption of the flow of Swift's thought. If there is any general murmuring it will probably be on this score: in the case of the political writings especially the reader is more likely to be impeded by his lack of knowledge concerning a contemporary allusion than he would be by a note explaining it. Those whose darkness has been lightened by the brilliance of Mr Davis's notes in his Oxford edition of *The Drapier's Letters* will be particularly regretful over his decision.

The choice of a basic text, never an easy matter, is unusually difficult in the case of Swift's works because they were so often printed without benefit of the author's supervision of the press. Mr Davis has decided to use, wherever possible, the edition of the works printed in Dublin by Faulkner, beginning in 1735. This edition has been in high favour since 1922, when Professor Hubbard defended its claims in his *Contributions Toward a Bibliography of "Gulliver's Travels."* The present reviewer is in a minority (perhaps a minority of one) in his extreme distrust of the Faulkner edition, particularly where the *Travels* are concerned. The grounds for this distrust are too complex to be detailed here. But they may be

briefly summarized. Internal and external evidence combine to show that Swift's personal oversight of the text of the Faulkner edition was fitful, and that much or most of the work was done by friends. Numerous revisions indicate that their author, whether Swift or another, had forgotten or had never known the reasons underlying the original passages involved. The compositors and proof-readers in Faulkner's shop were far more careless than those in Motte's establishment. Mr Davis is aware of these objections, as he has indicated in several places, but he does not believe them unanswerable.

Fortunately, in most of the works in the first three volumes of the new edition the variations between texts are infrequent: only a few affect the sense, except to cause occasional alterations of emphasis. There are some instances which raise the question whether Mr Davis might not well have departed now and then from his normal practice of reprinting "the final corrected and revised versions which appeared during Swift's lifetime." Swift's contributions to political controversy, for example, are more interesting and significant as they were first given to the public than as they were amended a quarter of a century after their composition. However, Mr Davis has provided a list of variant readings based upon a painstaking collation of the significant manuscript and printed texts: the reader who disagrees with the editor may always go his own way. And if he has, through experience, any conception of the labour that lies behind these textual notes so unobtrusively inserted at the end of each volume, constituting in many instances the first and only adequate apparatus for a critical examination of the text, he will be the more grateful for what will undoubtedly be, on its completion, the best edition of Swift's prose we have ever had.

SPEED-O-PRINT
-DUPLICATORS-

AUTOMATIC FEED 54.00
HAND FEED 38.50

For School, Church, Club and Industrial Use

WRITE FOR FURTHER PARTICULARS

or
See them on display at your local dealers

CANADIAN DISTRIBUTORS

The BROWN BROTHERS Limited
100 SIMCOE ST., TORONTO

SELF SEAL ENVELOPES
featured in
CHATEAU Ripple STATIONERY

SOLD BY LEADING STATIONERY, DRUG AND DEPARTMENT STORES

W. J. GAGE & CO., Limited - Toronto
Sole manufacturers of Self Seal Envelopes in Canada

ENVELOPES *Plain* *Printed* *Embossed*
TORONTO ENVELOPE CO. LIMITED
366 Adelaide Street West, Toronto 2, Ont.

For almost twenty years . . .

THE CANADIAN FORUM

A monthly periodical devoted to the arts and the social sciences has been keeping intelligent Canadians up-to-date in these fields.

SUBSCRIPTION $2.00 PER ANNUM

28 Wellington St. W., Toronto

1940 » BOUND VOLUME « 1940

Would you not care to have a bound set of all four issues for permanent record?

Send in your four numbers, even though they may be soiled, together with your cheque for $1.00. In return a new bound set will be mailed at once.

Just Published

ARMY WORK BOOK

GUIDANCE IN QUALIFICATION OF OFFICERS AND OTHER RANKS FOR PROMOTION

MAJOR B. E. TOLTON

and

CAPTAIN W. A. BRYCE

of

University of Toronto Contingent
Canadian Officers' Training Corps

INFANTRY (RIFLE)
AND
RELATED ARMS

To be Used in Conjunction with Training Pamphlet No. 1 and Infantry Section Leading 1938

$1.00
plus .10 postage

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS
TORONTO, CANADA
1941